

a Republican-led, taxpayer giveaway to the pharmaceutical industry; and on the other hand, he includes the very same provision in his own prescription drug bill. Plain as day, in black and white. It can be no clearer.

As a side note, Mr. Speaker, just in case my colleagues were wondering, the non-negotiation language also appeared in legislation introduced by the gentleman from California (Ms. ESHOO) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), Democratic Representatives, in 2000, a bill by the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) in 2000, which, by the way, 204 Democrats voted for as their floor alternative to H.R. 4680 in the previous Congress; and in the other body, Mr. Speaker, the non-interference or non-negotiation clause was used in legislation authored by Democratic Senator WYDEN in 2001 and again in the Jeffords-Breaux-Landrieu legislation in 2002.

A version of the noninterference language also appeared in the underlying Senate Medicare bill that passed the Senate June 27, 2003, by a bipartisan vote of 76 to 21. Thirty-five Democrats voted for it, a number of Senators, and I will not name their names, but a number of Democratic Senators all voted for that bill.

So why, Mr. Speaker, if this language has appeared so many times in legislation sponsored by both sides of the aisle, in both Chambers of Congress, do we continue to hear the negative rhetoric about such a great bill for our seniors? My guess, Mr. Speaker, it is just political posturing during an election year.

---

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from improper references to the Senate.

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

---

#### EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

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

There was no objection.

---

#### PRESCRIPTION DRUG BILL

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I did not come to the floor to speak about pre-

scription drugs, but I cannot let what the gentleman before me in the well said. He voted to prevent the Federal Government, unlike any other industrial nation on Earth, any other developed country, negotiating with the pharmaceutical industry for lower drug prices, unlike the private insurance industry, that can negotiate lower prices.

He says market forces will do better. Well, that is funny. Maybe the pharmaceutical industry would have fought against market forces. They plain and simple want to continue to gouge American consumers. The Bush administration's working day and night on this.

The Australian Free Trade Agreement prohibits the reimportation of U.S.-manufactured, FDA-approved drugs from Australia if they are cheaper than sold in the United States. They are working day and night to get Canada to agree to raise the price of FDA-approved, U.S.-manufactured drugs exported and sold in Canada at a lower price. They want the price lifted for the reimportation to the United States, and he comes to give us this little joke here after he has voted to prevent the one most effective measure we could have taken to give seniors and everyone else in this country a better deal on prescription drugs than market forces would do better. Yeah, sure.

#### JOB CREATION IN AMERICA

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, here is another thing that the Republicans have been talking a lot about. The President is concerned about jobs. Despite the worst job-loss record of any President since Herbert Hoover, he is really concerned. He has been appearing around the country with people and actually I kind of doubted him, but I found out yesterday in reading the Los Angeles Times that he does really care about jobs. The President really does care about creating jobs. The only problem is, he does not put any priority on where those jobs are created.

Here it is right here. Los Angeles Times, Bush supports shift of jobs overseas.

Whoa. Where is that coming from? Well, we have a few quotes to back it up. The administration's top economic adviser, "Outsourcing," i.e., moving American jobs overseas, "is just a new way of doing international trade. More things are tradeable than were tradeable in the past. And that's a good thing," says the President's own personally chosen senior economic adviser, Mr. Mankiw, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors.

He goes on to say, "The market is the best determinant of where the jobs should be," and that is according to Bush and Mankiw, overseas, not in the United States of America because there is cheaper labor over there.

He says here, people are concerned, maybe we will outsource a few radiologists. What does that mean? That means the false promise that was heard for years, do not worry about the industrial jobs; they are obsolete. They

say, I wonder how you are a great Nation if you do not make things. Let us accept their argument for a moment.

Then they said they would retrain American workers for those high-tech knowledge industry jobs. Radiology, that is a pretty educated job. We are going to export those. We are going to export a whole host of IT jobs. In fact, the prediction is we will export 3 million U.S. IT jobs over the next 10 years. This is the next huge hemorrhaging of U.S. jobs overseas, and what does the President think? He thinks it is a good thing because the labor is cheaper over there. It gives a better bottom line for the corporations.

What about the American workers? What are they going to do? Here are a couple of other quotes from Mr. Mankiw: "Shipping jobs to low-cost countries is the 'latest manifestation of the gains from trade.'" Shipping U.S. jobs overseas by the Bush administration is considered to be a gain from trade.

This is unbelievable, but at least they are finally being honest with us what they really believe, and they are now engaged in negotiating an expansion of NAFTA through the entire Central America, and they tell us this will be good for America. Why? Well, because the jobs would not have to travel quite as far from the United States. They would not have to go all the way to India or China. Maybe we can just export the jobs 1,000 miles down to South America so the owners of the corporations, the few managers that are left in the United States, can more easily get there to occasionally supervise their new workforce working down there in Chile or Argentina or someplace else.

That is their bottom line agenda here. They do not give a darn about American workers, American jobs, the industrial might of this country, the economic base of this country, the huge and growing trade deficit.

We are going to borrow more than \$500 billion from overseas this year because of our trade deficit. That is not sustainable. The dollar is dropping like a rock, and the Bush administration says that is a good thing because our goods will become cheaper. Guess what. We do not make much in America anymore; and if Bush has his way, we will not make anything in America anymore.

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

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

---

#### LESSONS LEARNED FROM MY TRIP TO IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN

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