

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. Chocola.

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

were surprised to learn that the differences have gotten worse.

For example, Zocor, a very commonly prescribed drug for people who have some heart problems or problems with their circulation, Zocor in the United States on average sells for \$85 for a month's supply. In Germany you can buy that drug for \$23.83.

Mr. Speaker, what is interesting about this story is that one of my colleagues came up to me and he saw this chart. He said, I take Zocor. I said how much do you pay for it. He said a copay for a U.S. Congressman for that Zocor is \$30 here in the United States. You can walk in off the street to the Metropolitan Pharmacy in Frankfurt, Germany and pay \$23.83, and the Germans think they are paying too much for prescription drugs.

Mr. Speaker, I am holding in my hand two boxes of Celebrex. They are exactly the same. They come from the same plant. If you bought this box of Celebrex in the United States, you would pay more than double what you pay for the same drug in Germany.

Now, I think Americans are willing to, and I speak on behalf of most Americans, we understand there is a cost to develop these drugs. There is a cost to market these drugs. Unfortunately, there is too much being spent on advertising, but I am not one who says they should not be able to advertise. But I believe Americans ought to have access to world-class drugs at world-market prices. I am asking my colleagues to join me in supporting, and I have another chart that is easier to read, compare London to Athens to the United States. We now have pharmacists from around the world who regularly send us their prices for the drugs.

In almost every case, it is less than half what we pay in the United States. These same five drugs, Lipitor, Nexium, Prevacid, Zoloft, and Zyrtec, those five drugs in London, \$195.95. In Athens, \$231.04; but here in the United States, \$507.96.

Mr. Speaker, I ask Members to please join me in cosponsoring H.R. 328, the Pharmaceutical Market Access Act of 2005. It is time to make clear that Americans have access to world-class drugs at world-market prices.

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

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina 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 gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. EMANUEL 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 North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MCHENRY 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 gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

#### AIRPORT COMPETITION IN DALLAS-FORT WORTH

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

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of a law which has fostered spectacular growth and vitality in my district and throughout all of north Texas. That law, which has become known as the Wright amendment, was passed in 1979 to settle for all time a controversy on how best to achieve robust competitive airline competition in the Dallas-Fort Worth area.

It has worked and continues to work beyond all expectations, but the benefits it has brought can easily be undone. Given all of the turmoil in the airline industry and the limited time for Congress to get important business done, any serious effort to change the current law would be a misuse of our time and resources.

Since the issue has been in the news lately and Members have been approached with very simplistic answers on the surface, compelling arguments about the Wright amendment, I want to put some facts into the RECORD.

In the late 1960s, the cities of Dallas and Fort Worth, at the urgings of the Civil Aeronautics Board, agreed to end the fragmentation of air service in the region and invest in a single regional airport that could serve all of the people in the area. At the time, everyone knew a new airport would not work unless there was an absolute commitment by all parties to consolidate all the service from the various local airports in the area into the new facility, which became known as the Dallas-Fort Worth International Airport.

The two communities and all carriers offering interstate service from the existing airports agreed on this course of action. However, one carrier that at that time offered only interstate service from Dallas' downtown airport, Love Field, refused to do so.

This led to a long and protracted and bitter legal battle between the communities and this carrier, which ultimately resulted in a carefully negotiated compromise. This compromise encompassed into Federal law to preserve it was exactly constructed to reflect the intent of the communities as

well as the desires of the interstate carrier.

Reluctantly, the civic parties agreed to allow the one carrier that had refused to move to the DFW Airport to operate out of Love Field to and from points within Texas or to its four contiguous States. That carrier agreed to the Wright amendment as a way to settle the issue for all time.

Last week, the highly respected global aviation consulting firm, Simat, Helliesen & Eichner, released an omnibus report which predicts devastating consequences to the Dallas-Fort Worth Airport if the Wright amendment were to be repealed. I will submit the report for the RECORD; but it predicts if the Wright amendment is repealed, DFW could lose 204 flights a day, 21 million passengers annually, and slash DFW passenger traffic back to levels seen 20 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, health in the airline industry is dependent on healthy competition between airlines. In contrast, competition between very closely located airports can be destructive. The communities of Dallas and Fort Worth understood this when they agreed to end, or restrict, commercial air traffic to their local airports. DFW was built to accommodate any and all carriers, and over the years it has attracted both network and low-cost carriers.

Just as importantly, by limiting traffic at the neighboring airports, DFW was able to compete among airports and now is the fifth largest airport. Think of it this way. Almost everyone would agree it would improve competition to have 30 airlines competing against each other, but no one would suggest it would be healthy to have 30 airports competing against each other. Just like two major shopping centers will die if located next door to each other, two airports located only 12 miles apart, as are in Dallas, Love Field and DFW will provide two weaker airports.

Let us be perfectly clear. Restriction at Meacham and Love Fields were not put in place to give DFW a jump start. No one said, We will invest billions of dollars in a huge international airport and domestic hub airport until it is successful and then we will undercut the very source of its success by reopening the airports that we closed to make it so. That does not make good business sense.

Mr. Speaker, DFW is what it is today because it is the only airport in the metroplex that passengers can use to fly anywhere in the world. Moreover, it has not achieved the success it has by being anticompetitive. On the contrary, it has always welcomed all comers. DFW currently has gates available and is seeking new airlines.

Love Field was never meant to be a competitor to DFW. In fact, DFW would probably have never been built and the tens of thousands of jobs and the billions of dollars of economic stimulus it has given Dallas-Fort Worth would never have been realized