

Democrats openly supported the measure; some Republicans openly opposed it. And vice versa.

The seriousness of the situation called for open, honest debate. No deal-making. No cajoling. No politics. Just an honest discussion, followed by an honest vote of conscience by each senator. As Republican whip, I worked with the Republican leader, Bob Dole, and the Democratic leaders, George Mitchell and Sam Nunn, to schedule the debate. As Republicans, Bob and I were responsible for scheduling time to speak for senators who supported the war. As Democrats, George and Sam were responsible for scheduling time to speak for those who opposed the war.

The night before this monumental debate, I sat in the Republican cloakroom with Sen. Dole. The mood was somber. The tension was palpable. We were on the verge of sending troops to war. Our national credibility was on the line. Would America stand up to tyranny and aggression in the Middle East? This was not some issue to be taken lightly.

As Bob and I discussed the debate schedule for the next day, a senator walked into our cloakroom and asked to speak to us. The senator's appearance and request surprised Bob and me. It surprised us because the senator was a Democrat, coming to ask for a favor. Who was that man?

It as Tennessee Sen. Al Gore Jr.

Sen. Gore got right to the point: "How much time will you give me if I support the president?" In layman's terms, Gore was asking how much debate time we would be willing to give him to speak on the floor if he voted with us.

"How much time will the Democrats give you?" Sen. Dole asked in response.

"Seven minutes," came the droning response.

"I'll give you 15 minutes," Dole said.

"And I'll give you five of mine, so you can have 20 minutes," I offered.

Gore seemed pleased, but made no final commitment, promising only to think it over.

Gore played hard to get. He had received his time. But now he wanted prime time. And Dole and I knew it. After Gore left, Dole asked Howard Greene, the Republican Senate secretary, to call Gore's office and promise that he would try to schedule Gore's 20 minutes during prime time, thus ensuring plenty of coverage in the news cycle.

Later that night, Sen. Gore called Greene and asked if Dole had him a prime time speaking slot. When Greene said nothing had been finalized yet, Gore erupted. "Damn it, Howard! If I don't get 20 minutes tomorrow, I'm going to vote the other way."

The following day, Gore arrived on the Senate floor with, I always thought, two speeches in hand. Gore was still waiting to see which side—Republicans or Democrats—would offer him the most and the best speaking time. Sen. Dole immediately asked the Senate to increase the amount of speaking time for both sides. I believe only then, after Gore realized we were asking for more time to make room for him on our side, that he finally decided to support the resolution authorizing the use of force to drive Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait.

It brings me no joy to recount the events leading up to the Gulf War vote. It isn't something I wanted to do. But it is something I have to do. I was there.

I have to set the record straight because the Gore campaign is now running an ad proclaiming that Al Gore, "broke with his own party to support the Gulf War." In reality, it's much closer to the truth to say he broke for the cameras to support the Gulf War.

And I have to set the record straight because the Gulf War vote was far too impor-

tant an issue to fall victim to politics and re-pulsive revising. It was a moment of challenge. And sadly, Al Gore was not up to it.

As a member of the U.S. Senate for 18 years, I saw many senators show their stuff when times got tough. And, sadly, I saw some who failed to rise to the occasion. In January of 1991, Al Gore put politics over principle.

#### DUQUESNE UNIVERSITY, MYLAN SCHOOL OF PHARMACY

#### HON. WILLIAM J. COYNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, September 12, 2000*

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, today I recognize the 75th anniversary of Duquesne University's Mylan School of Pharmacy.

Seventy-five years ago this month, the Duquesne School of Pharmacy opened its doors. In the subsequent years, it has prepared thousands of pharmacists who have gone on to provide competent, professional service and advice to people across the country. Thy Mylan School of Pharmacy is widely recognized as one of the best pharmacy schools in the country. I am proud that this outstanding institution is located in my congressional district.

#### TRIBUTE TO THE KLEIN BRANCH

#### HON. ROBERT A. BORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, September 12, 2000*

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I honor the Jewish Community Centers of Greater Philadelphia's Raymond and Miriam Klein Branch, as they celebrate 25 years of servicing their community.

The Klein Branch opened its doors to society in 1975, as a haven not only for its members, but also for all in the community. The Klein Branch began and continues to reach out to many people, including the youth, senior citizens, New Americans, and also those with special needs.

Currently, the Klein Branch of the Jewish Community Centers of Greater Philadelphia offers a wide array of activities and programs. They consist of: preschool and kindergarten, summer camp, adult education, exercise and fitness classes, senior adult programs and clubs, after school programs, single parents groups, teen programs, and numerous planned trips for all of its members. The Klein Branch facilitates programs that encompass many different age groups and specifications, as to meet the varying needs of all people.

At the Klein Branch, "family" is always a principal priority. The center offers events that the entire family can partake in such as movie night, bingo night, dances, theater programs, and community service days. These programs provide means for family members to interact with one another, and strengthen the ties between them.

The Klein Branch has also labored to educate its members on Jewish holidays, culture and traditions. The center presents holiday meals and educational events such as Book Festivals and film series. It has also created

specific centers for meeting the needs of the Jewish community, such as the Stern Hebrew High School, Jewish Family and Children Services, and Jewish Employment and Vocational Services.

Mr. Speaker, the Raymond and Miriam Klein Branch should be commended for its tireless pursuit to support and pull together the Philadelphia community. The Klein Branch's devotion to enriching the lives of all people who enter their facilities should be recognized, as its members achieve 25 fulfilling years of community service. I congratulate and offer my best wishes for continued education in the coming years.

#### U.S.-INDIA RELATIONS

#### HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, September 12, 2000*

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing H. Res. 572, a resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that it is in the interest of both the United States and India to expand and strengthen U.S.-India relations, intensify bilateral cooperation in the fight against terrorism, and broaden the on-going dialogue between the United States and India, of which the upcoming visit to the United States of the Prime Minister of India, Atal Bihari Vajpayee, is a significant step.

This coming Thursday, Indian Prime Minister Atal Vajpayee will address a joint session of Congress. His historic visit comes at a precious moment in U.S.-Indian relations. The world's two largest and most vibrant democracies are in the process of creating a relationship that truly reflects our mutual interests.

Both of our governments are dedicated to the protection of the rule of law, democracy and freedom of religion. Our citizens share a fervent faith in these core values. It is also why India and the United States see eye-to-eye on so many regional concerns.

China's hegemony, the spread of Islamic terrorism spilling out of Afghanistan and Pakistan, the narco-dictatorship in Burma, China's illegal occupation of Tibet, are serious concerns to both of our nations.

During this past summer, the world was horror stricken when Islamic terrorists gunned down some 101 Hindu pilgrims in Kashmir. The massacre came only two weeks after the largest militant Kashmiri group, Hezb-ul Mujahadeen, called for a cease fire. The killings were apparently done to sabotage any attempt to peacefully broker a settlement to the Kashmir crises. All of us are outraged by the brutal barbaric killings of innocent civilians.

Such malicious extraordinary violence reinforces my conviction that India and the United States must develop a much closer military and intelligence relationship. A special relationship is needed so that we can share our knowledge and skills in order to successfully confront our mutual enemies who wish to destroy the basic principles of our societies.

Regrettably, the State Department creates confusion among our friends and allies in Asia by promoting a "strategic partnership" with China and by ignoring the fact that Beijing, in violation of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, transfers and sells nuclear and ballistic

weapons technology to Pakistan, a militaristic nation that spreads terrorism throughout South Asia by supporting the Taliban and other repressive forces. China has also sold billions of dollars of arms to the narco dictatorship in Burma that borders on India.

We need to lift the remaining sanctions that were imposed on India for testing nuclear weapons. As long as the State Department permits China to go unchecked and it continues to stoke the fires in South Asia, India will need to be able to defend itself.

The Prime Minister's address to Congress this week will afford all of our Members of the House and Senate the opportunity to hear about issues of importance in the U.S.-India bilateral relationship, including trade, energy, investment, science, information technology, as well as cooperative efforts to combat terrorism and to achieve regional peace and security in South Asia—a region of prime importance to our national interests.

As the current Indian government works to ensure that India remains secure, we should be marching shoulder-to-shoulder with her during this new century.

I look forward to meeting with the Prime Minister and working closely with him and his government on initiatives that bring peace and prosperity to India and Asia, and even stronger bonds of friendship between our two nations.

I submit the full text of H. Res. 572 for the RECORD and I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

#### H. RES. 572

Whereas the United States and the Republic of India are two of the world's largest democracies that together represent one-fifth of the world's population and more than one-fourth of the world's economy;

Whereas the United States and India share common ideals and a vision for the 21st century, where freedom and democracy are the strongest foundations for peace and prosperity;

Whereas in keeping with this vision India has given refuge to His Holiness the Dalai Lama, Burmese refugees fleeing repression in Burma, and is a refuge for people in the region struggling for their basic human rights;

Whereas the United States and India are partners in peace with common interests in and complementary responsibility for ensuring international security and regional peace and stability;

Whereas the United States and India are allies in the cause of democracy, sharing our experience in nurturing and strengthening democratic institutions throughout the world and fighting the challenge to democratic order from forces such as terrorism;

Whereas the growing partnership between the United States and India is reinforced by the ties of scholarship, commerce, and increasingly of kinship among our people;

Whereas the industry, enterprise, and cultural contributions of Americans of Indian heritage have enriched and enlivened the societies of both the United States and India; and

Whereas the bonds of friendship between the United States and India can be deepened and strengthened through cooperative programs in areas such as education, science and technology, information technology, finance and investment, trade, agriculture, energy, the fight against poverty, improving the environment, infrastructure development, and the eradication of human suffering, disease, and poverty: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) the United States and the Republic of India should continue to expand and strengthen bilateral security, economic, and political ties for the mutual benefit of both countries, and for the maintenance of peace, stability, and prosperity in South Asia;

(2) the United States should consider removing existing unilateral legislative and administrative measures imposed against India, which prevent the normalization of United States-India bilateral economic and trade relations;

(3) established institutional and collaborative mechanisms between the United States and India should be maintained and enhanced to further a robust partnership between the two countries;

(4) it is vitally important that the United States and India continue to share information and intensify their cooperation in combating terrorism; and

(5) the upcoming visit of the Prime Minister of India, Atal Bihari Vajpayee, to the United States is a significant step toward broadening and deepening the friendship and cooperation between United States and India.

### WHAT'S SO GREAT ABOUT CANADA'S MEDICAL SYSTEM?

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, September 12, 2000*

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Bill McArthur is a practicing physician, research scientist and writer in Vancouver, B.C. In a recent issue of the *Las Vegas Review-Journal*, he criticizes some U.S. politicians for promising they can offer Americans much cheaper drugs simply by copying the Canadian pharmaceutical system. For one thing, he argues, the reason some drugs are 23 percent cheaper in Canada is that individual incomes there are 24 percent lower than in the United States, and therefore manufacturers there are able to make and sell drugs at a lower price.

The doctor stresses, however, that up to 50 percent of any Canada-United States price-differential is due to the cost of legal liability in the United States. Americans, he says, "sue more often, win their cases more often, and get much larger settlements than Canadians"—and those extra costs must be added to the price of United States drugs. In addition, he argues, much of the cost-differential is the result of the expensive continuous research and development effort in U.S. companies, where most of the world's new drugs and new cures are created.

In contrast to the significant progress of American medical technology, Dr. McArthur observes that Canada ranks "right in there with Poland, Mexico, and Turkey near the bottom of the 29 OECD countries." He concludes that any suggestion by politicians that pharmaceuticals are much cheaper in Canada "is just plain wrong."

Mr. Speaker, I submit Dr. McArthur's article, "What's So Great about Canada's Medical System?" as printed in the *Las Vegas Review-Journal* on September 1, 2000, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to enable all Americans to compare the real status of medical costs and services between our two countries.

[*Las Vegas Review-Journal*, Sept. 1, 2000]

### WHAT'S SO GREAT ABOUT CANADA'S MEDICAL SYSTEM?

PATIENTS PAY MORE FOR DRUGS; MANY COME TO U.S. FOR TREATMENT

(By Bill McArthur)

VANCOUVER, B.C.—Some politicians are promising they can deliver cheap drugs for Americans by copying the Canadian system. Beware—the silly season lasts until Nov. 7.

The claim that pharmaceuticals are hugely cheaper in Canada is just plain wrong. Many drugs are much more expensive in Canada and generic prices are consistently higher. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development reports that prices for brand name drugs are overall 23 percent lower in Canada. However, individual incomes of Canadians are 24 percent lower and the standard of living is lower.

That is what happens when an economy is badly managed—wages and standard of living decline and manufacturers are able to make and sell drugs and other products at a lower price.

The politicians promoting Canadian drug pricing should quit loading the buses bound for Canada and consider loading up 747's heading to Southeast Asia. Drugs and other products are really cheap there. However, per capita income, standard of living and prices are inseparable and I doubt Americans want a Southeast Asian standard of living.

Dr. Richard Manning, when at Brigham Young University in 1997, demonstrated that up to 50 percent of any Canada-U.S. price differential was due to the cost of legal liability in the United States.

Americans sue more often, win their cases more often and get much larger settlements than Canadians. These costs have to be added to the price of drugs and artificially jack up the cost to consumers.

I'll bet the folks clambering on the buses to Canada haven't been told they have very little hope of collecting anything if they suffer serious complications from drugs prescribed and purchased in Canada.

The bulk of the world's new drugs are developed in the United States. Canada and many other countries do not do their share of pharmaceutical R&D. So if all the really cheap drugs for Americans are bought from Third World countries, who will do the R&D?

The drug companies will be fine because they will have switched to making largely unregulated veterinary drugs or more likely, nonpharmaceutical products.

But who is going to do the R&D to develop the cures for diabetes, osteoporosis, coronary artery disease, Alzheimer's, Parkinson's and all the other diseases that affect the elderly?

No one—that's who! And with those over 65 doubling to 25 percent of the population by 2025, what lies ahead for those now under 40, when they reach their golden years—ill health and poverty—that's what.

I am a practicing physician in the pharmaceutical nirvana lauded by some U.S. politicians. Every day I see my patients suffering in the collapsing health-care system that we have in Canada. In terms of medical technology we rank right in there with Poland, Mexico and Turkey near the bottom of the 29 OECD countries.

Patients wait months for a simple CT scan or an MRI. Recently I had to tell a lady she had cancer and also that she had to wait 10 weeks for the appointment to be assessed for treatment.

In Ontario in one year, 121 people were permanently removed from the coronary artery bypass graft list because they had waited so long, they were now too ill to withstand the surgery.

One hundred twenty-one, souls condemned to a slow, unpleasant and very expensive death because of the lack of timely care.