

during the first year of the war could have been saved with the proper body armor; but we did not plan to protect them well.

Now with over 1,700 American soldiers dead, the government has continually neglected to plan for an end to this disastrous war. President Bush likes to talk about the importance of high troop morale, but he needs to talk to the Veterans Against the Iraq War. They will tell Members the best way to ensure high morale, and they will say the best way is for our soldiers to be assured they will actually be coming home, they will leave Iraq and there will be a plan to make it happen.

The way to ensure that and to raise their morale is by starting to bring them home. Why then has President Bush not stated America's long-term intentions in Iraq? His comments on the subject have been limited to statements like, We will stay until the mission has succeeded and not one day longer.

Mr. Speaker, how does he define the mission as succeeded when he will not even acknowledge that there is an actual end to the mission?

Even if the President will not create a plan to end the war in Iraq, there are many in Congress and around the country who will. Earlier this month nearly one-third of the House voted for the amendment I offered to the defense authorization bill to urge the President to create a plan for the withdrawal of troops from Iraq. This sensible amendment would not have whisked our troops out of Iraq prematurely, it simply asked the President to get busy and develop a plan for the end of this war.

Believe me, if he does not, we will because the people of this country want to bring our troops home. Fortunately, there is a plan that would secure America for the future, SMART Security. SMART is Sensible, Multilateral American Response to Terrorism for the 21st Century. SMART will help us address the threats we face as a Nation and will make war the last option.

SMART Security will prevent acts of terrorism in countries like Iraq by addressing the very conditions that allow terrorism to take root: Poverty, despair, resource scarcity and lack of educational opportunity.

SMART Security encourages the United States to work with other nations to address the most pressing global issues. SMART addresses global crises diplomatically instead of by resorting to armed conflict.

Efforts to help the Iraqi people must follow the SMART approach, humanitarian assistance coordinated with our international allies to rebuild Iraq's war torn physical and economic infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker, the American people clearly prefer the SMART approach to our current policies in Iraq. Nearly 60 percent of Americans believe the war in Iraq has been handled poorly and that the United States should immediately begin withdrawing some or all

of our troops. Let us support our troops in Iraq and the will of 60 percent of the American people. We can do both by beginning to bring home our troops serving in Iraq. The time is now. The time is now to end the United States military occupation of Iraq.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG PRICES

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, I rise again tonight on the floor of the House to talk about the issue of prescription drugs and how much Americans pay relative to consumers in the rest of the industrialized world. What we have on this chart are the prices effective February 7, 2005, so they are relatively new. We have prices here from the Metropolitan Pharmacy in Frankfurt, Germany, and a local pharmacy in my hometown of Rochester, Minnesota.

Over the last year, we expected the prices to narrow because of what has happened to the dollar relative to the euro, but, in fact, the price difference between what Americans pay and Germans pay has actually gotten worse.

Let me give a couple of examples. A drug called Norvasc, 30 tablets, 5 milligrams, in Rochester, Minnesota, \$54.83. In Germany, only \$19.31.

Drop down to another drug, and these are 10 of the most commonly prescribed drugs in the United States and in Europe. Zocor, \$85.39 for a month's supply in the United States, and in Germany it is \$23.83.

Mr. Speaker, what is important about that particular drug is for many of the programs, including many of the Federal employees, the copay here in the United States for that drug is \$30. You can walk in off the street and buy it at the Metropolitan Pharmacy in Frankfurt, Germany, for less than the copay in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the chart speaks for itself. The total for the 10 most commonly prescribed drugs in Germany is \$455.57. In the United States it is more than double that at \$1,040.04.

The question is how does this happen? The answer is Americans are held hostage because pharmaceutical companies get a special provision that nobody else gets. They deal with intellectual property, and the cost of that first product coming off the line is very expensive and that is why they have to have these high prices. I understand that. The cost of the research for a new drug is extremely high. That first new pill can cost 350, 400, maybe even \$500 million. But it is the same thing for Intel when they develop a new chip, but Intel does not get the same protections. They cannot sell their chips to Germans for half the price they sell them to Americans because the suppliers would start selling them back in the United States. That is what is called parallel trade, and that is what they have had in Germany for a long time.

Throughout the European Union, a pharmacist in Germany can buy their supplies from Spain or from Norway or wherever they can buy that Zocor cheaper. As a result, they have a competitive marketplace over there. If Members want to learn more about that, we have a videotape by Dr. Peter Rost, who is an M.D. and he is an executive with one of the largest pharmaceutical companies in the world, and he has come out in favor of parallel trading.

He is very strongly in favor of the bill I have introduced which is cosponsored by a wide range of Members of the House which would open up the pharmaceutical markets, much as we do with everything else.

I also want to say a special tribute to Minnesota's governor, Governor Tim Pawlenty, because he was one of the first governors to recognize that Minnesotans should not be held hostage. And now he has opened up not just the drugs from Canada, but we have actually opened up to Great Britain as well.

One of the things that he often says is the industry says this is unsafe. He says if it is really unsafe, show me the dead Canadians and the dead Europeans and the dead Germans.

The truth of the matter is they do this every day and they are not genetically smarter than we are. We ought to have the same ability to use parallel trade to reduce these outrageous prices here in the United States.

I also want to show a letter that I, and 220 of my colleagues, sent to the Speaker of the House recently. A majority of the Members of this House want to have a vote to allow Americans to have access to world-class drugs at world market prices, and we are going to continue to put pressure on the leadership, on the administration, on the FDA, whoever it takes to make certain Americans get fair prices.

Mr. Speaker, ultimately we do not want something for nothing. We do not believe we ought to take advantage of somebody else, but we do not think we should be taken advantage of either, and it is time Americans get fair prices. It really is time that the world's best customers have access to the world's best drugs at world market prices.

I hope more Members will join me in this effort because I believe the time has come to make that certain we open up these markets so we get fair prices for consumers. Whatever their particular condition, we want fair prices and we want them now.

AMERICAN FOREIGN SERVICE ASSOCIATION AWARD WITHDRAWN

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to express my disappointment with the American Foreign Service Association, and its decision to

withdraw awarding a "Constructive Dissent" award to U.S. Armenian Ambassador John Evans.

Ambassador Evans was due to receive the Christian A. Herter Award for intellectual courage, initiative, and integrity later this week. The award was as a result of courageous statements he made regarding the recognition of the Armenian genocide.

In a series of public statements, Ambassador Evans, who has studied Russian history at Yale and Columbia and Ottoman history at the Kennan Institute stated, "I will today call it the Armenian genocide."

Mr. Speaker, Ambassador Evans has studied history of Armenia, and based on his substantial studies of the issue, he is willing to go on the record and define the actions taken Armenians as genocide. The Armenian genocide was the systematic extermination, the murder, of 1.5 million Armenian men, women and children. To this day, the Republic of Turkey refuses to acknowledge the fact that this massive crime against humanity took place on soil under its control, and in the name of Turkish nationalism.

Unfortunately, some 90 years later, the U.S. State Department continues to support Turkey's demands and denials despite all evidence to the contrary. It is not likely that the State Department was happy that their Ambassador to Armenia acknowledged the Armenian genocide. And, therefore, Ambassador Evans retracted his remarks after receiving substantial pressure from the State Department.

Well, now the selection committee at the American Foreign Service Association has decided to withdraw the award with no reason for its actions. I find the timing of the decision peculiar. The sharp turnaround came right before Turkish Prime Minister Erdogan arrived in Washington for a meeting with President Bush. Based on past history, it is clear that the State Department, the Bush administration, and the pro-Turkish lobby pressured AFSA to withdraw Ambassador Evans' award.

It is simply unacceptable for this administration to continue to penalize the ambassador for his comments. Ambassador Evans did a courageous thing. His statements did not contradict U.S. policy, but rather articulated the same message that this administration has sent to the public. The only difference in this case is that Ambassador Evans assigned a word to define the actions taken against the Armenians.

□ 1930

This was a refreshing break, I must add, from a pattern on the part of the State Department of using evasive and euphemistic terminology to obscure the full reality of the Armenian genocide. Ambassador Evans pointed out, and I quote, that no American official has ever denied it, and went on to say, and I quote, I think we, the U.S. Government, owe you, our fellow citizens, a more frank and honest way of discussing this problem.

Ambassador Evans was merely recounting the historical record, which has been attested to by over 120 Holocaust and genocide scholars from around the world. By doing this, he earned a prestigious award that was taken from him because of politics and denial.

Mr. Speaker, I want to add my voice to all those who, in Ambassador Evans' own words, and again I am quoting, think it is unbecoming of us as Americans to play word games here. I believe in calling things by their name. Evans was right, and the American Foreign Service Association was correct in awarding him the Christian A. Herter Award. We should encourage our Ambassadors to speak the truth, and, more broadly, end, once and for all, our complicity in Turkey's campaign of genocide denial.

Mr. Speaker, Ambassador Evans has been penalized for simply telling the truth. The American Foreign Service Association has set a terrible example by retracting Ambassador Evans' award. I guess, even in America, the Turkish Government is able to stifle debate.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2862, SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mr. GINGREY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-122) on the resolution (H. Res. 314) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2862) making appropriations for Science, the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

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

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

CAFTA: A LOSE-LOSE PROPOSITION

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight during the 5-minute time in opposition to the flawed free trade agreement the administration signed with the Dominican Republic and Central American countries. My colleague from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) has an hour later, but I wanted to do a 5-minute on the Central American Free Trade Agreement and the Dominican Republic.

Over the past year we have continued to learn about this agreement. During this time the opposition to CAFTA, as it is called, has only grown stronger. The more we learn, the more we realize that CAFTA is a lose-lose proposition. It is no secret that CAFTA is modeled after the NAFTA agreement that was supposed to create new markets for U.S. products and lift up the low-income people in Mexico. The unfortunate result of NAFTA was the loss of 50,000 jobs and a widening of the income gap in Mexico.

Make no mistake, wealth in Mexico has increased since NAFTA, but it has not been evenly distributed. Since NAFTA, an additional 19 million Mexicans are impoverished, and President Vicente Fox has stated that 54 million Mexicans are too poor to meet their basic needs. With 10 percent of the Mexican population controlling half of the nation's wealth, it is easy to see that the average Mexican worker has not benefited from NAFTA. One would think our country would learn from the many failures of NAFTA instead of applying the nearly identical trade provisions to the Central American and Dominican Republic.

I have long opposed free trade agreements with countries with substantially lower standards of living than we have here in the United States. I am proud to represent the third most blue-collar district in our country. The workers in our district benefit from the labor laws on the books of our country. While our labor laws could certainly be strengthened, they ensure that our blue-collar workers receive a living wage and make up a thriving middle class in our country, although a shrinking middle class in our country, might I add.

I have no doubts whatsoever about the skills and productivity of our American workers, but they cannot compete against similar workers in Nicaragua, for example, where wages average about \$200 a month. This salary differential puts the American worker and American products at a disadvantage, one that this country should not allow to be exploited through a free trade agreement.

The labor laws of the CAFTA countries do not come close to meeting international standards. Each of the DR-CAFTA countries has been cited by the International Labor Organization for policies which provide inadequate protection against antiunion discrimination. Four of the five countries have laws on the books that significantly impede workers' ability to strike, and each of the countries has laws that restrict union formation or union leadership.

Mr. Speaker, free enterprise includes not only me as a businessperson, but also me as a person to be able to collectively bargain for my wages and my working conditions. What is worse, the CAFTA agreement has no real enforcement mechanism to force a change in these labor laws. True, the agreement