

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