

Lynch	Pascrell	Sherwood
Mack	Pastor	Shimkus
Maloney	Pearce	Shuster
Manzullo	Pelosi	Simmons
Marchant	Pece	Simpson
Markey	Peterson (MN)	Skelton
Marshall	Peterson (PA)	Slaughter
Matheson	Petri	Smith (NJ)
Matsui	Pickering	Smith (TX)
McCarthy	Pitts	Smith (WA)
McCaul (TX)	Platts	Snyder
McCollum (MN)	Poe	Sodrel
McCotter	Pombo	Solis
McCrery	Pomeroy	Spratt
McGovern	Porter	Stearns
McHenry	Price (GA)	Strickland
McHugh	Price (NC)	Stupak
McIntyre	Pryce (OH)	Stullivan
McKeon	Putnam	Sweeney
McMorris	Radanovich	Tancredo
McNulty	Rahall	Tanner
Meehan	Ramstad	Tauscher
Meek (FL)	Regula	Taylor (MS)
Meeks (NY)	Rehberg	Taylor (NC)
Melancon	Reichert	Terry
Menendez	Renzi	Thomas
Mica	Reyes	Thompson (CA)
Michaud	Reynolds	Thompson (MS)
Millender-	Rogers (AL)	Thornberry
McDonald	Rogers (KY)	Tiahrt
Miller (FL)	Rogers (MI)	Tiberi
Miller (MI)	Rohrabacher	Tierney
Miller (NC)	Ros-Lehtinen	Turner
Miller, Gary	Ross	Udall (CO)
Miller, George	Rothman	Udall (NM)
Mollohan	Roybal-Allard	Upton
Moore (KS)	Royce	Van Hollen
Moran (KS)	Ruppersberger	Velázquez
Moran (VA)	Rush	Vislosky
Murphy	Ryan (OH)	Walden (OR)
Murtha	Ryan (WI)	Walsh
Musgrave	Ryan (KS)	Wamp
Myrick	Sabo	Wasserman
Nadler	Salazar	Schultz
Napolitano	Sánchez, Linda	Watson
Neal (MA)	T.	Weiner
Neugebauer	Sánchez, Loretta	Weldon (FL)
Ney	Sanders	Weldon (PA)
Northup	Saxton	Weller
Norwood	Schiff	Westmoreland
Nunes	Schwartz (PA)	Whitfield
Nussle	Scott (GA)	Wicker
Oberstar	Scott (VA)	Wilson (NM)
Obey	Sensenbrenner	Wilson (SC)
Olver	Serrano	Wolf
Ortiz	Sessions	Wu
Osborne	Shadegg	Wynn
Otter	Shaw	Young (AK)
Oxley	Shays	Young (FL)
Pallone	Sherman	

NAYS—19

Baldwin	Lewis (GA)	Schakowsky
Conyers	McDermott	Stark
Duncan	McKinney	Waters
Filner	Owens	Watt
Hinches	Paul	Woolsey
Kucinich	Payne	
Lee	Rangel	

NOT VOTING—16

Baker	Harris	Souder
Boyd	Herseth	Towns
Brown, Corrine	Istook	Waxman
Crenshaw	Lewis (KY)	Wexler
Flake	Moore (WI)	
Granger	Schwarz (MI)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS) (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1939

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON H.R. 2985, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mr. YOUNG of Florida, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-139) on the bill (H.R. 2985) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 10, CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AUTHORIZING CONGRESS TO PROHIBIT PHYSICAL DESECRATION OF THE FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. GINGREY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-140) on the resolution (H. Res. 330) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 10) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing the Congress to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2475, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006

Mr. GINGREY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-141) on the resolution (H. Res. 331) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2475) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2006 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, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBERS AS COSPONSORS OF H.R. 2646

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, on June 17, the following Members were inadvertently added as cosponsors of H.R. 2646: the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. BROWN), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP), the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY), the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERY), the gentleman from Montana (Mr. REHBERG), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KELLER).

I ask unanimous consent to have their names removed as cosponsors of H.R. 2646 at this time.

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

There was no objection.

SENATOR DURBIN'S COMMENTS

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, last week Senator DURBIN compared American soldiers to Nazis, to the Soviets in the Gulags, and to Pol Pot.

These comments were the latest in a series of leftist attacks on our war against the terror in the Middle East and on our hard-line approach to terrorism here at home.

I want to assure my constituents that neither my party nor I believe America is what is wrong with this world. And no one should think for a minute, not even for a second, that we are in the wrong here. I have been to Iraq and to Afghanistan, and this political tactic sickens me.

If one wants to criticize our policies, fine. If one wants to call for withdrawal, that is just fine. But characterizing the actions of our Armed Forces as Nazi-like is reprehensible.

And to our Armed Forces and their wonderful families, I just want to say "thank you." They are making a difference, and most of us are standing with them 100 percent of the time.

PUBLIC BROADCASTING

(Mr. BLUMENAUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, we are facing a storm of controversy surrounding public broadcasting. There are ominous signs of interference and people concerned about trying to impose their political agenda on our independent public broadcasting system.

We have seen Draconian and unjustified proposals coming from the Committee on Appropriations to slash funding for the next year and eliminate Federal support altogether in the future.

In 2001, we formed the Public Broadcasting Caucus in Congress precisely for the reason to enable us to come together in a bipartisan way to deal with the controversial and complex issues surrounding public broadcasting. This would be a great time for Members who have not yet joined to become members to enable their staff to take advantage of opportunity and information and, frankly, in a small way, to show some measure of support.

I look forward to the debate later this week during the Labor-HHS appropriations bill not just to restore critical funding. My hope is that as a result of this controversy, we will emerge with a better understanding of why we support the public broadcasting. I hope we are doing so in a way that provides the continuity and stability so essential to the critical service enjoyed by

28 million listeners each month and the 70 percent of television owners who watch public television.

□ 1945

A VOTE FOR CAFTA IS A VOTE FOR NATIONAL SECURITY

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, as all of us know, CAFTA was finished last year and will soon be taken up by the Congress.

While trade is a critical component of CAFTA, we must recognize that CAFTA is more than just about trade. We have a national security imperative in passing CAFTA. It is an important component of U.S. efforts to address the conditions that breed instability, terrorism, and international criminal activity.

We must help ensure that the countries in Central America have the ability to fight the threats to their democratic institutions. Helping their economic growth is a critical factor to achieving success.

CAFTA is the vehicle for achieving such important U.S. foreign policy and security objectives. CAFTA's defeat would harm not only trade, but antiterrorism and antinarcotic efforts as well.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the passage of CAFTA. A vote for CAFTA is a vote for U.S. national security.

COMMERCE AND CENSORSHIP

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as Congress considers the Central American Free Trade Agreement, we can look on the other side of the world on what our trade agreements and trade policies have wrought.

USA Today has an editorial today I will read from for a moment: "Part of the Internet's magic is the freedom it bestows to travel as far as your mind can take you. But not if you're in China.

"Software giant Microsoft has agreed to block certain words: democracy, freedom, and human rights among them," on the Internet as part of its new Chinese Internet portal. They have been joined by Yahoo and by Google.

So, Mr. Speaker, write in the words "democracy" or "freedom" or the phrase "human rights," and what comes up on your screen as those words are blocked? It says, "This item should not contain forbidden speech, such as profanity." Human rights, freedom, democracy? That is profanity?

Mr. Speaker, these trade agreements we have signed, coupled with our striving for freedom around the world and what our businesses say about their

wanting to promote freedom and democracy, sound a bit hollow.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT). 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 HIGH COST OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS FOR AMERICANS

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, once again I rise to talk about an issue that altogether too many Americans know more about than perhaps some folks here in Washington, and that is the almost inexcusable high prices for prescription drugs here in the United States. The more we learn about this subject, the more frustrating it becomes, because what we have learned over the last 5 or 6 years is it is not just that Americans pay high prices for prescription drugs; it is that people in industrialized countries like Germany and France and Switzerland pay so much less than we do.

What I have here is a chart, and I know these letters are almost too small to see on the television cameras, but let me point out a couple of the numbers. This is a chart of comparative prices that we got from a pharmacy in Frankfurt, Germany, called Metropolitan Pharmacy; and then we got prices from a local pharmacy in Rochester, Minnesota, for exactly the same drugs made in the same plants under the same FDA approval. What we see are some amazing differences.

Look at, for example, the drug Nexium, 30 tablets, 20 milligrams. In Germany, you can walk in with a prescription and buy that drug at the Metropolitan Pharmacy for \$60.25. That exact same drug in Rochester, Minnesota, will cost you \$145.33.

Let me just say that prices do vary from pharmacy to pharmacy; but I would guarantee that here in Washington, D.C., the price would probably be at least \$145.33.

Let us take the drug Zocor, 30 tablets, 10 milligrams. In Germany you can buy that drug for \$23.83, but here in the United States you would have to pay \$85.39.

Now, that is bad enough. But if you total all of these up, these are 10 of the more commonly prescribed drugs in the United States and Germany, the total for those drugs for a month's supply in Frankfurt, Germany, \$455.57. Those same drugs here in the United States, \$1,040.4. That is a 128 percent difference.

Now, this chart actually gets more interesting, because we have pharmacists all over the world now who send us their prices on a regular basis

so we can compare what is happening to drug prices. One year ago, when we compared a basket, now the drugs changed slightly, because some of these drugs went off patent, and so the basket of drugs changed slightly, but 1 year ago, the difference between the basket of 10 of the most commonly prescribed drugs in Germany was \$430, and here in the United States it was \$866. It was exactly a 100 percent difference.

The point I want to make here is during that period, during that 1-year time period, what happened was the value of the dollar relative to the euro actually came down.

Now, I am not a monetarist, I do not quite understand these exchanges sometimes, but the people who do tell me that actually what should have happened is the price differential between the United States and Germany should have gotten less. It actually got worse.

People ask, well, how could that happen? How could it be that the difference between what Americans pay and Germans pay actually got worse? Well, the reason is Americans are held hostage. The American market is a captive market, because not only do we give the pharmaceutical companies, which I believe we should give them the rights that they have in terms of their patent rights and so forth, I do not think that we should do anything to hurt people's patent rights; but what we have done in the United States is different than just giving them patent rights. Intellectual property deserves patent protection.

For example, we know that when Intel comes out with a new computer chip, that first chip off the line can cost \$500 million, but we do not tell Intel that you can also control that product after you make the first sale. In other words, if they sell that chip to a distributor in Japan for \$25 and they want to sell it to American manufacturers for \$75, they cannot control what that distributor in Japan does. We have open markets.

That is what we want to create here in the Congress. We have a majority of the House and a majority of the Senate who believe that it is time to stop holding Americans captive. We understand that these drugs cost a lot of money to develop.

We as Americans are willing to pay our share in terms of developing those drugs; but, unfortunately, Americans pay in three different ways for these drugs. First of all, we pay in the prices, and they are inflated. They are the highest prices in the world for these drugs. Secondly, we pay, in some respects, through our Tax Code, because when companies develop these drugs here in the United States, they get to write off all of the cost of those research and development dollars.

But, third, and this is also important, Americans pay more than any other country through our tax dollars to help develop these drugs. This year, we will spend over \$20 billion through various