

that today. From gallons of nerve gas and rooms full of test tubes and trailers full of equipment so sophisticated that biological and chemical weapons could be pumped out on Saddam's command? Apparently not that, either.

We had a policy with regard to Iraq. It was a frustrating policy, but it was working. It is the same policy President Reagan used on the Soviet Union: containment. We had an embargo in place that the rest of the world supported. We had U.N. inspectors in place that the rest of the world supported. They did not have as long to look for weapons as our people have now had, but they were looking, and while they were in Iraq, Saddam was not going to be able to fulfill any of his evil dreams.

Containment worked from the end of the Gulf War until the day we invaded. If you believe that the United States should go to war to get rid of dictators who would most likely want to have weapons of mass destruction if they were not watched closely, I will give you a list. If you believe the United States should go to war to get rid of dictators who have people tortured, I will give you another list. If you believe that the United States should go to war bringing democracy to someone else's country is a mission worth the lives of our young soldiers, I will give you a list.

But if you share the belief of John Quincy Adams, the sixth President of the United States, that our country is blessed, in part, because "she does not go abroad in search of monsters to destroy," I say to my colleagues, we were all misled, and it is time for us to have a bipartisan committee, select committee, to look at this issue and find out who was it that misled us?

I read in the paper today that Mr. Blair gave us some bad information, and our President took it, swallowed it hook, line and sinker, and now says, I did not know; it was Blair that gave me this bad information. Mr. Blair answered questions for 2½ hours before the Parliament of the United Kingdom. We ought to have that kind of thing going on here.

COMPETITIVE TENSION WILL LOWER DRUG PRICES FOR AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GERLACH). 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 to talk about the high price that Americans pay for prescription drugs relative to the rest of the world. I have with me a chart, and some of my colleagues have seen this chart, and I apologize, it is a little hard to read for the Members who are watching in their offices on C-SPAN, but what it really shows us are 10 of the most commonly prescribed drugs that I and my staff purchased when we were in Germany about 2 months ago

at the Munich Airport Pharmacy, and then a comparison of what those drugs sell for here in the United States.

Let me just read for my colleagues what some of those prices are. Cipro, a drug that we learned a lot about when we had anthrax here in the Capitol complex, is a very effective antibiotic, made by a company called Bayer. They also make aspirin and a lot of other drugs. The price in Germany for 10 tablets, 250 milligrams: \$35.12. That same Cipro here in the United States: \$55.05.

A drug that my father takes, Coumadin, is a blood thinner. Some of my colleagues say, well, we cannot open up markets because people might get rat poisoning. Mr. Speaker, Coumadin is rat poisoning. It was developed at the University of Wisconsin veterinary schools, and it sells under the generic name of Warfarin. But Coumadin in the United States, and my father takes it, the price for 100 tablets, 5 milligrams in the United States: \$89.95. In Germany you can buy that same Coumadin for \$21.

Glucophage is a very commonly prescribed drug for people who have borderline diabetes. In the United States the price is \$29.95 for 30 tablets. In Germany we bought that drug for \$5.

Another drug that we paid for, the taxpayers, you paid for this drug, Tamoxifen, a very amazing anti-breast-cancer drug, we paid about, I think the number was over \$500 million through the NIH to develop and take the drug through phase 2 trials. We pay in the United States \$360. They buy that drug in Germany for 60 bucks. Now, we paid for the development, and now, apparently, we are paying for the marketing, the advertising and, ultimately, for the profit on that drug.

The bottom line is these 10 drugs bought in Munich, Germany, the total price in dollars: \$373.30. Those same drugs bought here in the United States: \$1,039.65.

My colleagues do not have to take my word for it. Today, like Diogenes, I finally found an honest person inside the administration who will talk honestly about what we pay for drugs. She is an IG, an inspector general, in the Department of Health and Human Services. Her name is Dara Corrigan. She testified before the Committee on the Budget today. She said that Medicare last year spent about \$8.2 billion on drugs, drugs that are administered in hospitals. She said, according to her research, that the Medicare people paid \$1.9 billion more than they would have had to pay for the same drugs had they bought them through the VA.

Now, I asked her, had they or anybody done any comparisons between how much Medicare is currently paying or will pay as we move down the road towards a prescription drug benefit under Medicare; how much would they pay if they could have bought those drugs from pharmacies right off the rack in Germany or Switzerland or some other industrialized country?

The bottom line is this, I say to my colleagues: We need to do something

about this, because it is not so much shame on the pharmaceutical industry, although it is hard for me to defend this. I am a Republican; I believe that profit is a good word. But profiteering is a bad word, and somehow we have to come to grips and create a market environment so that we have competitive prices, because Americans deserve world-class drugs, but they deserve to be able to buy those drugs at world-market prices.

So my answer may not be the best answer, but at least it is an answer: to bring an element of competition, competitive tension, into the prices that we pay relative to the rest of the world.

I believe that Americans should pay their fair share of the cost of research, and I am proud of the fact that we do pay our fair share. In fact, I think we ought to be able to subsidize, we ought to be willing to subsidize the people in sub-Saharan Africa, but I do not think we ought to have to subsidize the starving Swiss.

This is not just about economics, it is not just about the prices we pay. There is a moral undertone to this. I think, I say to my colleagues, it is time for us to take a very clear stand. The rumor is we may actually get a vote on this in the next week or 10 days. When we do, we are going to be asked, will we stand with the large pharmaceutical companies, or will we stand with our consumers? I hope we will give the right answer.

U.S. CAN NO LONGER AFFORD TO IGNORE AFRICA

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

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, for the next week, Africa will be on page 1 news due to the President's trip to the continent. Then, once again, news on Africa will most likely recede to the back pages of our major newspapers and disappear for good. However, what many Americans do not realize is the increasing importance of Africa to the world and the United States.

Americans now import more than one-quarter of their oil from the African continent. In the coming years, due to new major oil discoveries in the Gulf of Guinea off the west coast of Africa, the percentage of African oil Americans consume will most likely rise. It will rise because there are quantities of untapped oil reserves on the continent, and it will rise because the United States realizes that oil from the Middle East can easily fall prey to the vagaries of wars and politics.

Africa is so important to us, in part, because it is a continent rich in natural resources. Copper, diamonds, gold, and wood are all in abundance throughout the continent. The Congo River itself has enough potential hydroelectric power to supply the electrical needs of the whole continent. And the

continent still has abundant rainforests which have been described as the lungs of the world.

We as Congresspeople can no longer afford to ignore Africa or view it solely through the lens of disaster and peril. Yes, we cannot deny that there are serious health problems in Africa with HIV/AIDS and malaria leading the list. There is crushing poverty throughout the continent. Africans living on less than \$1 a day now number over 315 million, according to a recent World Bank survey. Serious conflicts in the Congo, where not thousands, but millions have perished, and West Africa still plagues the continent and puts a serious drag on the development of human resources and capital.

We cannot afford to ignore Africa, because people are beginning to realize that failed states and crushing poverty are fertile breeding grounds for terrorists and criminal groups. We cannot afford to ignore Africa, because the world is smaller and more interconnected. From the war on terrorism to the supply of crucial resources, from the campaign against threatening diseases to the opportunities for economic trade and investment, Africa is a key global player. We cannot afford to ignore Africa, because we now ignore it, and if we continue to do it, it is at our own peril.

Africa really matters in many ways. Not all of the news coming out of Africa is gloomy. Trade and investments with Africa are growing. U.S. exports totaled over \$5.8 billion last year, while U.S. imports were \$18 billion. Nigeria alone is the fifth largest supplier of oil to the U.S. Despite appearances, Africa is more peaceful today than in the 1980s and the 1990s. Democracy is also taking root in many parts of Africa.

But Africa needs increased resources to deal with the multitude of problems. U.S. assistance to Africa has been stagnant for many years, and real development assistance to the continent is less than \$500 million. Although total U.S. assistance to Africa may total about \$2 billion, a large chunk of this is for humanitarian and health-related programs. Many programs, including the areas of agriculture, democracy, conflict resolution, trade, and investment have suffered from significant cutbacks. In short, Africa needs increased assistance if it truly is to be brought into the mainstream world economy.

The Congressional Black Caucus has been a staunch advocate and played a pivotal role in strengthening the cultural, political, and economic ties between Africa and the United States.

I am therefore concerned, but not surprised, that President Bush did not seek out the guidance and assistance of the CBC before making his sojourn to Africa. This is not surprising because, as our chairman recently noted, "the President has declined all of our offers to meet with him since our last discussion of January 31, 2001."

In closing, I want to make a few remarks on the President's proposal to send in U.S. peacekeepers to Liberia. First, I recognize the longstanding historical ties between the U.S.

and Liberia. I do not believe it will be as difficult to win the hearts and minds of Liberians who are predisposed to look upon the U.S. with favor. I generally support the concept of a peacekeeping mission to Liberia. However, I believe that a U.S.-led peacekeeping mission should be placed under the auspices of the United Nations. The United States by itself cannot be the policeman of the world, and our forces are already spread thin by our other significant commitments around the world. Any U.S. action in Liberia will have greater credibility if they have the seal of approval of an international body.

We must also think through very carefully our commitment to place U.S. forces in Liberia. We must have a mission that is clearly defined, and we must have an exit plan that is articulated and understood by the American public. I also believe that any plan to introduce U.S. forces in Liberia should be subjected to serious congressional oversight and approval.

The devil is in the details. The administration must first clearly articulate its methods and goals before any U.S. troops are put on the ground.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. ROS-LEHTINEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

TRIBUTE TO RICHARD BRANDITZ IGLEHART

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives in the Capital of this country to pay tribute to one of California's most beloved public servants: Alameda County Superior Court Judge Richard B. Iglehart, who passed away in Istanbul on July 2 while attending a State Department-sponsored conference. He was just 60 years old. He was a friend, a brother, a colleague, and he leaves behind so many wonderful people. He is survived by his beloved wife Judith Iglehart; his son, Matthew Iglehart; his stepsons, Christopher and Scott; his sister Barbara; his brother-in-law Hans; Alan Iglehart, a brother; six nephews and nieces, aunts and cousins, and his former wife, Dee Iglehart.

I met Dick in Santa Clara Law School. Before that, he had gone to Piedmont High School and UC Berkeley where he was a Beta and played rugby. He served in the Army in Germany as an officer in the 3rd Armored Cavalry. After graduating, he went to Santa Clara Law School where I met him.

□ 1945

He ended up being a career prosecutor who became the chief assistant district attorney in Alameda and also in San Francisco Counties. He became

the chief assistant for the criminal division in the California attorney general's office under Attorney General John van de Camp. Dick also served as the counsel to the Assembly Public Safety Committee. He was a California district attorneys association lobbyist and was an Assembly Fellow.

He worked unceasingly to rid California and the Nation of assault weapons. He was instrumental in helping pass legislation lowering the penalties on marijuana possession. He changed the laws, making it easier for child sexual assault victims to testify in court. He was an expert on sentencing procedures, the California three strikes laws, Proposition 36, and serial killers, and an early champion for using DNA as a testing in criminal trials.

He taught at Hastings, and he also gave courses for continuing education of the bar. He lectured at the FBI Academy, Berkley Center for Study of Law and Society, and he often spoke at the local high schools.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Ms. LEE), who is in the district that Dick is from so she can also pay tribute. While she is coming to the microphone, I will say that while we are here on the floor there is a memorial service in her district at Piedmont at the Piedmont Community Church.

Ms. LEE. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding and just say tonight that I join with the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) and all of our colleagues in remembering and celebrating the life of a great human being, a giant, a constituent, my friend, Richard Iglehart.

While serving as a member of the Assembly Public Safety Committee in the California legislature, I had the real privilege of working very closely with Dick when he was chief counsel to the committee. And I came to rely on his thoughtfulness, his fairness and his wisdom. When working with Dick, I was always deeply impressed with his ability to do simple things simple and he always did what he said he would do.

Dick's passionate and unshakable belief in our system of justice provided the foundation for everything that he accomplished in his legal career. His vast knowledge of the law and our government earned him the respect of defenders and prosecutors, liberals and conservatives, Democrats and Republicans. Dick met people where they were and brought them along. He took the time to help them see things from a different perspective or to shed light on a complicated subject. He was a true mentor, and it was my great and very good fortune to have been really one of his students. I will miss his kind words of encouragement and support.

One could not know Dick without knowing of his love and his devotion to his wife, Judy, and his family. He was a good friend to so many of us. Words cannot express my sympathy and sorrow at his untimely death. Let us