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 improve 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.

In the case of one drug for glaucoma, Xalatan, the cost in the U.S. is $631 a year. If we buy it in Canada, it is $429 a year. If the government negotiated, as the VA does, we can get it for $336 a year; but under the brilliant Republican plan here in the House, a drug that costs $631 a year will cost a senior $746. They will pay actually more than the drug costs today list price. This is the grand new benefit that they are going to deliver at a cost of $400 billion.

We could lower the price of drugs more substantially for every American, particularly those on Medicare, by simply voting for and allowing the safe reimportation of U.S.-manufactured, FDA-certified drugs from Canada, plain and simple.

We are going to hear a whole host of reasons why that is a bad idea. It will hurt their profits. Yes, it will hurt their profits. They say, well, if our profits go down, we will not do the research. That is a lie. The pharmaceutical industry makes its money on new drugs. They get an exclusive 17-year patent for those drugs. That is their profit center. The last thing that is going to go is the research because that is where they are going to make their money. Maybe they will cut the obscene salaries of their CEOs. Maybe they can be get by on two, three million a year instead of sixty.

Maybe they will cut the billions they are spending to direct promote their drugs on television, something that was outlawed by the FCC and the FDA until quite recently and something that is very problematic, to get people induced to go out and by a particular drug, to go into their doctor who is pushed for time and say I want that purple pill, I saw it on television. Well, that is not what you need. I want the purple pill. Okay, I have only got 10 minutes, you are out of here, you have got the prescription. Doctors tell me they do that. So if they saved those billions, they cut the salaries and some of their other overhead and administrative costs, they would still have plenty of money to do the research, and they could still earn a good profit; but Americans would pay 40 or 50 percent less for their drugs.

They say this legislation will kill people. They claim somehow the drugs that took a vacation to Canada have become unsafe while they were there. They say this will kill people. I will tell my colleagues what is killing people in the United States of America today: the fact that they cannot afford life-saving drugs. There are seniors in my district who divide their drugs in half. There are seniors in my district, couples, who decide which one is going to get the critical drugs this month because they cannot afford to buy all of them because they do not have a benefit. That is killing people.

Bringing back U.S.-manufactured, FDA-certified drugs from Canada is not going to kill people. It will kill obscene profits on the part of this industry because they are gouging America's seniors. America's seniors are paying twice as much as people in Canada for many drugs and even more if we go across the border to Mexico.

So this is going to be a simple vote, but it is going to be a vote on which millions of dollars are unleashed to send false messages to try and pressure Members of Congress to vote against the interests of all Americans who would be healthier and benefit from less expensive drugs. We could do this through the miracle of market forces and, yes, even free trade.

I voted against the NAFTA agreement. I think it stinks and it is killing jobs in this country; but guess what, probably prohibiting the reimportation of drugs is NAFTA illegal, but no one ever files a complaint when these NAFTA illegal things benefit the big corporations, only when they benefit people, and this Congress is going to try and stop changes in that situation.

THE CLEAR ACT OF 2003

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

Mr. NORWOOD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to share another tragic story with my colleagues of another senseless criminal act that could have and should have never happened but was allowed to take place because of our broken immigration system.

By the accounts of those who knew him best, 27-year-old Tony Zeppetella was a model son, a good brother, a loving husband and father, and a valued law enforcement officer with the Oceanside, California, Police Department. Sadly, the world lost Officer Zeppetella just last month when he was gunned down on a routine traffic stop. According to witnesses, it was a brutal gangland-style murder. Officer Zeppetella was shot once as he was walking away from the suspect's car. The suspect then pistol-whipped Officer Zeppetella, grabbing his firearm in the process and shooting him again at point blank range.

Madam Speaker, the individual accused and arrested for the murder is Adrian Camacho, an illegal and criminal alien who has a rap sheet that includes numerous gang- and drug-related charges and convictions and hard prison time. While it appears Adrian Camacho has been deported a number of times to his home country of Mexico, he was allowed to continue to return to his personal criminal playground, the United States, time after time after time.

America's committed law enforcement officers who protect us every day, officers like Tony Zeppetella, deserve better than an immigration system that creates a revolving door for 80,000 criminal aliens living in the United States, a system that asks them to spend their time arresting, then rearresting the same individuals. This makes their job far more difficult and dangerous than it already is.

Earlier this month, along with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD), the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HART), and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL), I introduced The CLEAR Act. It is a bill that would address our Nation's criminal alien crisis and make a real difference for our men and women wearing the badge.

More specifically, The CLEAR Act would require the Federal Government to take custody of criminal and illegal aliens apprehended by local and State law enforcement agencies or else pay the locality to detain them. It would also create a new system for the Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement, or now known as BICE, to take custody of criminal and illegal aliens from localities and take them to a BICE facility for processing and deportation.

If a Federal agency is truly uncooperative in this process, The CLEAR Act allows the local or State law enforcement department to hold that agency accountable by establishing an unprecedented administrative review process and fine schedule.

□ 2000

Lastly, the CLEAR Act would create a very real financial disincentive for criminal and illegal aliens, like Adrian Camacho, from illegally returning to the United States over and over again.

It is also a bill that carries the endorsement and support of our Nation's well-respected law enforcement groups, groups such as the National Sheriffs' Association, the Law Enforcement Alliance of America, the Southern States Police Benevolent Association, and the Friends of Immigration Law Enforcement. These are groups that represent America's rank-and-file officers and are groups that understand that an immigration system that allows 400,000 illegal immigrants with deportation orders to walk our streets and a system that allows 80,000 criminal aliens to continually commit violent and horrific crimes within our borders is an immigration system that puts our men and women wearing the badge in additional undue and unnecessary danger.

Madam Speaker, Officer Tony Zeppetella is a hero to the people whose lives he touched, his family, his wife and infant child, and friends and fellow officers that he left behind, but he is also a hero to all of us who are Americans because of his service to make our Nation a safer place.

Madam Speaker, it is time our Federal Government and this Congress got serious about our criminal alien crisis. The dangerously inefficient immigration system we have today has created far too many stories like that of Officer Zeppetella.

I urge my colleagues to do the right thing. Take a thoughtful, long look at our problem. Support our local and State law enforcement officers. Support the CLEAR Act, and let us