

achieve on its own. This task is so monumental that we must be open to accepting all types of assistance from other countries. Increased multilateralism reduces our financial burden, reduces our exposure of our troops, helps repair our international alliances and diffuses the international and regional criticisms that we are receiving about our presence in Iraq today.

The United States currently has approximately 150,000 military personnel in Iraq, and between 12,000 and 15,000 allied forces are also in Iraq. In order to avoid the financial burden and criticism that the United States is an adversarial occupation force in Iraq, it is important to involve more international forces. And given the current level of deadly guerrilla attacks on our American soldiers, 34 American soldiers have died since the President declared major combat operations over on May 1, and the growing strength of Saddam Hussein's loyalists, it is very clear that this war is very far from being over.

We need additional forces and particularly an international force of police officers and civilians that can keep the peace in Iraq so that rebuilding can take place. There can be no building in Iraq if Iraq is not secure and safe.

We must involve the United Nations. We must involve NATO and other nations in rebuilding Iraq's infrastructure. And most importantly, as a fundamental prerequisite to economic redevelopment, the United States and the international community must reestablish Iraq's banking system. You cannot move to rebuild anything if your banking system is out of repair. We must create a uniform currency, and we must develop a plan for an electronic system of financial transactions that includes lines of credit, capital requirements and prudential oversight.

In addition, Iraq needs that uniform currency. Because, right now, there are four different forms of currency being in operation in Iraq. An economy cannot be developed if there are four pieces of different moneys. We have got to have a medium of exchange and a store of value in order to revive its economy and in order to encourage foreign investors and, most importantly, to develop Iraqi-owned businesses.

Furthermore, the United States and its allies need to help Iraq quickly increase its current oil production from 800,000 barrels per day as of now, of which 500,000 barrels per day are needed for domestic consumption, to increase to its pre-war production of 3 million barrels per day. It is vitally important that Iraq's oil industry be reestablished so that it can help pay to rebuild the country's infrastructure since it is the country's largest exporter and foreign currency earner, largest industry and one of their largest employers.

All of this requires that the United States establish a long-term plan for our military presence in Iraq, a strong long-term diplomatic strategy in Iraq

to involve more nations and a blueprint with specific benchmarks and timetables for turning over the reins to the Iraqi people as soon as it is practical.

Often our parties, Democrat and Republican, we oftentimes divide on which is the more important component, foreign policy, military or diplomacy, and for some reason, too often it is assumed that to support one of these is to reject the other. I disagree. Diplomacy is nothing if not backed with strength and force. At the same time, strong force may end the immediate threat, but without diplomatic action such a victory will be short-lived and will create new instabilities.

That is where we are right now in Iraq. Indeed, our military force has won the war, but we are weak in having a strong diplomatic presence that is credible in the region to bring about a lasting peace, curb the violence and the guerrilla warfare so that rebuilding can take place.

We must have both. We must maintain a strong military to give weight to our words, both with our allies and with our enemies. And yet if the current post-war situation in Iraq teaches us anything, it is that force alone will not create stability or democracy. Diplomacy must be aggressively valued and pursued to maintain a lasting peace and to ensure our soldiers did not die in vain. Strong military and strong diplomacy must go hand in hand if we are to be successful in Iraq and successful with our foreign policy.

□ 2130

FREE-MARKET ACCESS FOR PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, Ronald Reagan used to say that, "If you say something that's not true, and you don't know it's not true, well, that's a mistake. But when you say something that's not true and you know it's not true, well, that's a lie."

We have had an awful lot of things that have been said in the last couple of weeks about a bill that I am very involved with in terms of opening up markets so that Americans can have access to world-class drugs at world market prices, and some of the groups have gone over the edge, especially as it relates to tying the issue of abortion to the issue of allowing Americans to have access to cheaper drugs around the world.

I want to read from a letter from one of my heroes, and he is a fellow who served in this House admirably for 6 years. I was privileged to serve with him, Mr. Speaker. Dr. Tom Coburn is an OB-GYN, and he served in Congress for 6 years. He sent a letter to Members of Congress when he heard that the

pharmaceutical industry is somehow tying RU-486 to the debate about reimportation of drugs.

Now, Dr. Coburn was one of the most militant advocates and defenders of the sanctity of human life that the Congress has ever seen. He was also a supporter and an author of the bill to open up markets so that Americans could have access to those drugs at fairer prices. He says in his letter, and I will submit the entire letter for the RECORD, but he says in his letter, and I quote: "As a pro-life practicing physician who earned a 100 percent pro-life voting record while serving in Congress, I find it ludicrous that those who oppose your legislation would resort to ad hominem attacks with no basis in reality."

He goes on, and it is a very strong letter. I also want to submit for the RECORD a letter from our colleagues, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), who are very active and co-chairmen of the House Pro-Life Caucus, and they say in their letter, and I will submit it for the RECORD: "While we both wish RU-486 were not legal, this debate is not about abortion."

I want to come back to my original point, that when you say something that is not true and you know it is not true, well, that is a lie. If anyone should know the rules about RU-486, one would think that the people who make the drug would know the rules here in the United States. RU-486 cannot be purchased in the United States of America with a prescription. It cannot be purchased without a prescription. It can only be administered in a doctor's office by a doctor.

In other words, no one can go to a doctor's office and have the doctor write out a prescription to take to the pharmacy and buy the drug. Therefore, nothing that we are talking about in terms of importation of legal FDA-approved drugs from FDA-approved facilities around the world, nothing in that legislation could be impacted by RU-486 because it cannot be obtained without a prescription. It cannot be obtained with a prescription. More importantly, RU-486 is completely illegal in Canada and Mexico.

So when you say something that is not true and you know it is not true, well, that is a lie. And that is the kind of thing that we have had to deal with in the last several weeks. Now, we in politics are used to puffery. We are used to distortions. We are used to people sometimes saying things that are not completely truthful. We have half-truths. But this is a bald-face lie.

So I come to the floor today to say that people can disagree about whether or not Americans should have to pay the highest prices in the world for prescription drugs, but these groups that oppose this do so for what I believe is clearly a profit motive. In other words, it is the pharmaceutical companies who understand that if we pass this

bill, prescription drug prices in the United States are going to drop dramatically.

I have used examples and I have my charts, and people can argue with my charts, although no one does. The pharmaceutical industry can come in and say, well, it is not true that Americans really have to pay \$360 for Tamoxifen while they can buy it for \$60 in Germany. Maybe that is true, maybe it is not true; but that is what we found out in the research we did. We bought the drug in Munich, Germany, for \$59.05. We called pharmacies here in Washington, D.C. and asked them how much does this particular drug in this particular milligrams, this number of tablets, what does it sell for, and they said it is \$360.

Now, maybe we are wrong, but that is an honest mistake. But we believe we are telling the truth, and in everything we have done we have cited our sources. Now, some people have questioned our sources, but they are making up facts that they know are not true. This is not about abortion. It is not about RU-486. The question that we are going to be asked, hopefully next week, is will we stand with American consumers, or will we stand with the giant pharmaceutical industry. I hope we will get the right answer.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the letters I referred to above:

JULY 10, 2003.

Hon. GIL GUTKNECHT,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR GIL. I was shocked to learn that some opponents of free-market access for prescription drugs have begun arguing that your legislation, H.R. 2427, the "Pharmaceutical Market Access Act of 2003" somehow promotes abortion and, more specifically, the availability of abortion drugs such as RU-486.

As you may recall, while in the House I was the author of not only provisions to permit the reimportation of FDA-approved drugs, but also the author of the House-approved proposal to block FDA-approval of RU-486. As a pro-life practicing physician who earned a 100 percent pro-life voting record while serving in Congress, I find it ludicrous that those who oppose your legislation would resort to ad hominem attacks with no basis in reality.

I can state unequivocally that your legislation in no way, shape, or form promotes abortion. Many pro-life members are original cosponsors of your legislation and, quite obviously, do not believe your bill violates their deeply held convictions about the sanctity of life. Those who argue that your legislation makes abortion drugs more accessible by lowering overall drug prices necessitate the conclusion that in order to be pro-life one must be in favor of increasing all drug costs. I suppose the argument would be the higher the drug costs the more fervent your pro-life beliefs.

In Washington, it was always sad to see organizations drift from their core principles and take positions that defined common sense and logic. Any organization that links your legislation with the abortion debate will, in the long-term undermine their credibility and relevancy in Washington. While the pharmaceutical industry has provided many wonderful saving drugs, it would be unwise for anyone to believe that the indus-

try that developed and fought for FDA approval of RU-486 is now motivated by a passion for the pro-life cause.

The fact that opponents of your legislation have resorted to these attacks is shameful, yet the obtuseness of their logic ultimately serves to highlight the soundness of your argument.

Sincerely yours,

TOM A. COBURN, M.D.
Former Member of Congress.

JULY 16, 2003.

DEAR COLLEAGUE. While we do not agree on the reimportation of prescription drugs, we both have devoted our careers to defending the sanctity of human life. We are disheartened by recent ads and targeted mailings that attack Members' pro-life credentials even in cases where Members have 10 percent pro-life voting records.

While we both wish the RU-486 were not legal, this debate is not about abortion. Many pro-life Members are original cosponsors of legislation that would allow the reimportation of prescription drugs, and many pro-life Members staunchly oppose this proposal.

Any effort to tangle this issue with abortion is misleading. We must not confuse the fight to defend the innocent life with a dispute over whether or not to import drugs from foreign countries.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH R. PITTS,
Chairman, House Values Action Team.
CHRIS SMITH,
Co-Chairman, House Pro-Life Caucus.

DEMOCRATIC STUDY GROUP ON NATIONAL SECURITY

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, tonight I am proud to join my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT), as well as our other colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL), as Chairs of the Democratic Study Group on National Security.

Mr. Speaker, we founded this group to advance principles and policies of national security which will strengthen America. We have been meeting with nations, top national security experts, and we have been taking to the House floor to respond to world events. We will also be introducing legislative matters to improve our safety here and around the world. I hope to address one of those tonight, that of the intelligence on Iraq's weapons of mass destruction.

But, first, I would like to articulate 10 principles of national security which I believe unite those that have come to associate themselves with the Democratic Study Group on National Security.

First, our soldiers. We support our men and women in uniform, our soldiers, our sailors, our marines, our airmen and -women, our veterans, our reservists, our National Guard, completely and unequivocally. Our soldiers are the foundation of our Nation's security.

Second, military strength. We believe that America's military strength

is superior in every respect, and we are committed to making sure it remains that way. The supremacy of America's military capability is the cornerstone of our security.

Number three, military transformation. We believe that America's military must be transformed to one that is more versatile, more agile, more capable of responding to multiple crises in far-away places and even more technologically powerful.

Number four, troop levels. We believe America's Armed Forces must not be overextended; that our reserves must not be stretched too thin; that the number of our troops must reflect the number of our military commitments we are likely to face and the severity of those commitments. We must either reduce the number of our commitments or increase the number of our troops. As General Shinseki recently said, "Beware the 12-division strategy for a 10-division army."

Number five, intelligence. We believe that in the war on terrorism, top-quality human and technological sources of intelligence are essential and that the reporting of intelligence must be accurate, timely, and properly weighted. The assimilation of that intelligence will be essential if we are to avoid another September 11.

Six, vision. We believe that America cannot make itself secure by virtue of its military power alone; that moral authority, integrity, generosity, and vision are vital to our peace and prosperity. An America that inspires hope in its ideals must complement an America that inspires awe in its strength. We are a more secure America when we rally the world to our side in a great cause.

Seven, democracy. We believe that the best hope for a secure America rests in the propagation of democracy around the world and that every instrument of American influence, diplomatic, military and economic, should advance the cause of democracy abroad. Democracies are poor breeding grounds for terrorism and war.

Eight, civil rights. We believe that America must be confident in its strength, vigilant in the defense of the homeland, supportive of police and firefighters on the front line, and jealously protective of the rights of all Americans. We will not let terrorists change our way of life, we will not live in fear, and we will not undermine the civil rights which characterize our democracy.

Nine, commerce. We believe that the free and fair flow of goods and commerce has the capability of lifting countries out of the despair of poverty and that we must act resolutely to eradicate the economic deprivation which allows the germ of terrorism to spread. Americans are blessed with great plenty. We are a generous people, and we have a moral obligation to assist those who are suffering from poverty, disease, war, and famine.

Finally, number ten, world community. We believe that America lives in