

sides of the aisle, people who do not usually see issues alike and come together, but find a common set of values in this legislation that opens up the market on prescription drugs to Canada and other, European countries.

Through competition, we would lower prices, and the truth is for all too long the elderly and the American families in our country, in our districts, have been subsidizing the poor, starving French and German and Swiss and English and Canadians who have artificially low prices. And we have been charged overwhelmingly; we pay in this country top, premium prices for prescription drugs.

What I want to do and what this legislation would call for in a bipartisan fashion would open up the market. We have a closed market now. We do not have that type of closed market when it comes to cars, when it comes to steel, when it comes to food products, when it comes to software, when it comes to all types of products; but in the area of pharmaceuticals, we have a closed market, and Americans are paying top, premium prices.

Two weeks ago Families USA released a study. Prices for the top 50 drugs most commonly prescribed to seniors increased at 3½ times the rate of inflation. Total spending for senior citizens on prescription drugs rose an estimated 44 percent between 2000 and 2003. The only means available to reduce prices of prescription drugs which our families and our seniors pay at the local pharmacy is to have real competition.

In Canada, in England, France, Germany, many of the folks there pay 30, 40, 50 percent less for the same name-brand drugs. Why? Because the pharmaceutical industry can, here in America, charge a premium. We pay the highest prices, and the only way we pay the highest prices is so they can afford to pay the lowest prices.

In my view, it is time that we have legislation that ensures open access, open markets in the area of pharmaceutical medication, and through that free market, we will reduce prices.

Second, if you are about to embark on the largest expansion of entitlement in over 40 years, \$400 billion, would you not want to ensure that the taxpayers got the best bang for their buck? \$400 billion we are about to ask the taxpayers to spend, and yet we do nothing to protect the taxpayers or the elderly to get the best price for that.

Now, this question is whether we will go over 10 years. My view is, if we are about to ask them to pay \$400 billion to subsidize prescription drugs for our elderly, we should ensure that if we can save 25 percent, 30 percent, 40 percent, which is what you can do through market access, we should afford the taxpayers and the elderly reduced, affordable prices.

One, guarantee the taxpayers of this country the best prices their money can buy. Two, ensure that our elderly, who are on fixed incomes, get the types

of prices that are now being paid for the same medications in France, Germany, England or Canada. We will then need not ask our seniors to pay the premium price.

Now, one myth that the pharmaceutical industry keeps spreading is that somehow this is about safety, that the FDA cannot do this. The truth is, if somebody tells you it is not about money, it is about money, and that is what is at stake here. The pharmaceutical industry understands that for a very long time they have had a protective market here in the United States. If we were to open up the market, they would have real competition and the prices would drop.

Second, I think it is very, very important. I understand the political process, as everybody does. We should all know that the pharmaceutical industry has about 600-some-odd lobbyists here in town. It is about a lobbyist and a half for each Member of the United States Congress. They give out and support through donations and other entertainment close to \$200 million and support the candidates and Members of Congress through entertainment and donations. But the \$200 million we get, and there is nothing wrong with that, that is what they do, that is what they advocate for their position.

But the \$200 million they give out in donations, contributions and entertainment pales in comparison to the \$200 billion our seniors have been overcharged.

When this vote occurs this week, each Member will ask to speak and vote on behalf of the people of their district, and the question will be, will we continue a practice in which our elderly are overcharged by \$200 billion, our taxpayers will be overcharged and pay the top, premium price rather than the most affordable price; or will we continue to accept these types of donations and entertainment and put our interests above the people that we represent?

I have full faith in my colleagues here that we will stand up for the people we represent, because we came here not just to be another vote but to be a voice for their values. Their values say, it is time to ensure that our taxpayers and our elderly stop subsidizing those in Europe and in Canada with more affordable prices while we in America pay premium prices.

HONORING SENATOR ROBERT J. DOLE

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. Madam Speaker, I rise this evening to pay tribute to a great man and a great Kansan, Senator Robert J. Dole. Tomorrow, July 22, is Senator Dole's 80th birthday. In those 80 years, Senator Dole has become one of the most influential

figures in American politics. Part of the Greatest Generation, Senator Dole is an example of an ordinary American who was called upon to meet extraordinary challenges and has risen to those challenges time and time again.

A native of Russell, Kansas, Senator Dole was born to humble beginnings. I grew up within 20 miles of Bob Dole's hometown, and I know the dedication, commitment, love and respect that the people of Russell share for their hometown hero.

In high school, Senator Dole was a good student and a good athlete and went on to enroll at the University of Kansas to pursue his lifelong dream of becoming a physician. Like so many of his time, he heard the call to defend his country and left KU after his sophomore year to join the U.S. Army.

Dole excelled in the military and he served as a platoon leader of the 10th Mountain Division in the allied liberation of northern Italy. For his service and bravery in World War II, Senator Dole was decorated with two Purple Hearts and a Bronze Star medal.

Senator Dole is also well known for his service to our country as a Congressman, a U.S. Senator and the longest-serving Senate majority leader.

Senator Dole began his public service as the county attorney in Russell County where the entire county's population is less than 10,000 people. From there, he served 4 years in the State legislature before being elected to Congress where he would serve for the next 36 years.

During his time on Capitol Hill, Senator Dole was known as a tireless leader who worked relentlessly to forge alliances in order to pass significant legislation. As a disabled veteran, he championed legislation to improve the condition of his fellow veterans and for the disabled, including the landmark bill, the Americans with Disabilities Act. Senator Dole also served as Gerald Ford's running mate in 1976 and received the Republican nomination for President in 1996.

Starting this week, Senator Dole's legacy of public service will live on through the Robert J. Dole Institute of Politics at the University of Kansas. The Institute's director and four-time Presidential librarian, Richard Norton Smith, explained that "this place is about service, that every generation could be the greatest generation."

The Institute is a resource for the citizens of our great State and for our Nation. The Center for Politics and Media focuses on public programming, including the Dole Lecture Series, the Dole Prize for Leadership, and the Presidential Lecture Series. The KU campus will also be enriched by this new collection of resources.

I am proud that my alma mater, the University of Kansas, has created this living tribute to a life of service. A university has no greater mission than to prepare our Nation's future leaders. This center will serve as a tremendous resource in that cause.

Since Saturday, Lawrence, Kansas, has been the center of a 4-day celebration culminating in the formal dedication ceremony of the Institute tomorrow morning. The dedication festivities include activities reminiscent of World War II, including an air show, an airplane display, a veterans' reunion, a living history encampment, and a reenacted USO show.

□ 1945

These activities are only a small token of Kansas' appreciation and affection for Senator Dole. It is my hope he will realize how much his lifetime of public service means to our State and Nation.

Bob Dole is a tremendous role model for those of us involved in public service. I thank Senator Dole for his service to our country. He exemplifies so well our country's Greatest Generation, and happy birthday.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BACA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. HARRIS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXPRESSING OPPOSITION TO SINGAPORE-CHILE FREE TRADE AGREEMENTS

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

Mr. BACA. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Singapore-Chile Free Trade Agreement. The Singapore-Chile Free Trade Agreement will do nothing to promote free trade and will do nothing to help workers in this Nation. We need jobs right here in the United States, right here, not in another country.

We have seen the damage that has happened when Congress passed free trade agreements. NAFTA cost the Americans 766,000 jobs, 80,000 from California alone. We need to create jobs for working families here in the United States. We must not let this happen again. Our people need jobs. They need to put food on the table, not fear that their jobs are going to be lost to some foreign country.

By negotiating this agreement, it is clear that the administration has overstepped its authority by creating an agreement that does not protect the rights of the American worker, I state, does not protect the rights of the American workers.

These agreements will further hurt the American manufacturing jobs at a time when we watched 56,000 manufacturing jobs disappear last month.

They are an assault on workers' rights. In the Singapore agreement, there is only one enforceable provision

that attempts to protect workers, one, I state one; but that provision ultimately will do nothing to protect workers because it merely says that Singapore should uphold its labor regulations. Furthermore, it does not even say what those regulations are; and under this agreement, Singapore is allowed to define what rights workers have.

This is unacceptable. What will happen to workers if Singapore decides to ban unions? What will happen to workers if Singapore decides to allow sweat shops and child labor? What will the United States be able to do under this agreement? Nothing, absolutely nothing. This agreement ties our hands. This agreement will allow countries to weaken labor standards and exploit workers all in the name of profit. It is not safe, and it is not fair; but the lack of labor standards is not what is wrong with this agreement.

The Singapore agreement contains a provision that has no reason to be included. Under this agreement, Singapore will be able to import raw materials from countries like China and assemble them and import it into America duty free. Why is this provision there? China has a horrible labor standard and runs prison labor camps. Why are we allowing China to benefit from this? We are giving China, who has very few protections for its workers, the right to piggyback on this agreement and bring goods to America duty free.

Is this a free trade agreement with China, or is it with Singapore? Why must we support China's poor labor standards? There is no reason and no excuse for this unfair, dangerous provision. This agreement should be about trade and improving economic interests of both nations.

So why is it that there are immigration rules included in this agreement? The administration tried to slip one over on Congress by negotiating a new rule for temporary foreign workers. They overstepped the bounds set by the Trade Promotion Authority and reduced Congress' role to a rubber stamp. Well, I will not stamp it.

Immigration legislation demands debate. It demands the attention of our committees. The safety of our country is at risk when immigration rules are decided in back rooms and dark corners. We want safety, and we demand fairness. It is not fair to transfer workers all the way from Singapore and Chile to take away jobs while an entire workforce, ready, willing and able, stands behind a fence at Mexico's border.

These agreements are not safe, and they are not fair. America should be worried. Its workers should be worried. We must not let this become the future example for a free trade agreement with America. We must stand together and fight against unfair and unsafe agreements that hurt the American workers. We must support our workers, the American workers. We need to im-

prove the quality of life here in America.

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

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

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

There was no objection.

HOUSE REPUBLICAN PRESCRIPTION DRUG PLAN: A BITTER PILL FOR AMERICA'S SENIORS

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, this week the House will take a historic vote, probably very late toward the end of the week, late in the evening, giving the pharmaceutical industry the maximum amount of time to beat back a provision of law that would lower the price of prescription drugs for every American, not just those on Medicare, but every American.

Let us use a couple of examples here. This is a simple vote. It would allow Americans to reimport, without limit, American-manufactured, FDA-certified, safe drugs from Canada back into the United States. The interesting thing about these drugs is they are manufactured in the United States of America; but when they take a vacation to Canada, their price drops dramatically because the Government of Canada, unlike the Government of the United States, with the exception of the Veterans Department and some other agencies at the Pentagon, negotiates with the pharmaceutical industry and negotiates lower prices. They use market forces to benefit the people of Canada.

The Republicans here in the House, bizarrely enough, are offering a \$400 billion prescription drug benefit for seniors that is based on subsidies to the private insurance industry and supporting the outrageous list price for drugs, which no one pays except the uninsured; but they would mandate that that be done. They would outlaw the United States Government from negotiating lower prices, unlike the Government of Canada, the Government of Great Britain, the governments of all the EU, virtually every other government in the world. In almost every country in the world a person can buy U.S.-manufactured, FDA-certified drugs for a substantial discount below the price those drugs are made available here.