

are my numbers. Because I went to Germany 2 months ago, and we bought 10 of the most commonly prescribed drugs. The total price in the United States for those same drugs, \$1,389.65. We paid \$373.30 in Munich, Germany. I cannot explain that. They cannot explain that.

We know that, for example, every day Americans consume thousands of tons of imported foods. Last year, we imported 318,000 tons of plantains. We imported \$1.1 billion worth of bananas last year.

□ 2030

Americans gladly consume those bananas. About 40 percent of the orange juice that we consume in the United States now comes from other countries. We are an importer. Markets work. The reason we import is because we can buy those products cheaper in those markets than we can produce them here in the United States. But in many cases we are not talking about products that are produced somewhere else. Many of these products are produced here. But we are talking about products produced in FDA-approved facilities, drugs like Coumadin, which my father takes.

We bought Coumadin in Munich, Germany for \$21. This same Coumadin package in Washington, D.C. sells for \$89.95. Let us talk about ethics. Two years ago this package of drugs in the United States sold for \$64. Nothing has changed. This drug was developed in the 1940s at the University of Wisconsin Veterinarian School. How did it go from \$64 2 years ago to \$89 today? Is that ethical? Is that responsible? Yet they sell it in Germany for \$21.

My colleague talked about Tamoxifen. The American taxpayers paid to develop Tamoxifen. We paid hundreds of millions of your taxpayer dollars to develop Tamoxifen. They sell it in Germany for \$60. A woman suffering from breast cancer here in the United States will pay \$360 for this drug. Is that ethical? Is that responsible? Is that the kind of companies we are dealing with? Go down the list.

We had another example in several of the publications. The drug Taxol, we paid for the development. We took it through phase 2 trials at the NIH, the National Institutes of Health. We paid for all of that, hundreds of millions of dollars; and then the company came along and signed a licensing agreement, and we have gotten royalties back of \$35 million, but the company has had sales of \$9 billion. We got \$35 million for the taxpayers after spending almost \$500 million for developing the drug, and they got \$9 billion in sales.

Let us talk about ethics and being responsible. We had a big debate last year about Enron and the stock holding companies and insider trading. We said this ethics thing has to change. This is one way we change it. We open up markets and hold people accountable, and things will change.

PROPOSED MEDICARE BILLS FALL SHORT

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

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I, too, feel the unease of those who spoke before me about the information the President gave us on a reason for going to Iraq. I think it requires investigation. It requires us to know the truth. I do hope when Tony Blair comes on Thursday, we will begin to know the truth.

But in the meanwhile, I want to inform American seniors about the Medicare reform bill that will be considered by the House/Senate conferees. I want to protect and respect our seniors, but I am shocked at the bill the House majority passed by only one vote just over a week ago. Medicare beneficiaries have waited a long time for help; but, unfortunately, the proposed legislation falls short of what seniors and disabled Americans have been waiting for.

We are at a time when we know the miracle of science. Prescription drugs can be miraculous in their power to cure and improve the quality of life of our seniors. We in government have the responsibility to capitalize on the advantages of science and help our seniors. By adding a prescription drug benefit to Medicare, a program that seniors know and trust, seniors will have an improved quality of life at a reduced cost to taxpayers over the long term.

A Medicare prescription drug benefit should be affordable, reducing the exorbitant prices of drugs, meaningful with guaranteed benefits, within Medicare, and available to all regardless of where they live.

So it is with great disappointment, Mr. Speaker, that I look at the proposals that were on this floor for Medicare reform. The House Republican bill fails to meet each one of the basic standards. The House bill does nothing to reduce the cost of prescription drugs. It creates a coverage gap so wide that almost 50 percent of seniors will fall into it.

Under the House bill, seniors pay the first \$250 of their drug costs, then 20 percent up to \$2,000. They will receive no assistance at all between \$2,000 and \$4,900. The bill also allows insurers to vary their benefit levels and prices around the country. Insurers will be able to limit access to specific drugs and pharmaceuticals. The House bill fails to guarantee the same benefits for the 9.2 million Medicare beneficiaries in rural communities, and it even prohibits the Secretary of HHS from negotiating a better price for seniors.

The bill that was passed by the House is designed to privatize Medicare, leaving seniors at the mercy of the HMOs and private insurance plans.

This bill uses private drug-only plans to administer the prescription drug program. These are plans that do not exist anywhere today. These plans

could force seniors to leave trusted doctors and hospitals. Even worse, by 2010 the House bill turns the traditional Medicare program into a voucher program.

The Federal Government should provide a safety net for the citizens of America. Unfortunately, the House-passed bill does not include any important fall-back provisions. Under the Senate-passed bill, if at least two private plans fail to enter the market in a region, the Federal Government will step in and offer beneficiaries a Medicare prescription drug benefit. Private plans have not worked in many parts of the country, and over the past 5 years more than 2 million seniors have been abandoned by private HMOs seeking higher profit elsewhere.

I urge my colleagues to recognize this failure and vote accordingly. American seniors, do not be fooled.

CHINA AND HUMAN RIGHTS

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on International Relations and the Human Rights Caucus, I rise today to talk about China. I know we in Washington are not talking about China much these days other than China is a great example of economic opportunity for American enterprise, and so it is. But before the Congressional Human Rights Caucus last week, we gathered to hear luminaries like Harry Wu, Chinese dissident, founder of the Laogai Research Foundation, and an even more famous dissident, Way Ting Sheng, a man who has been nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize a half dozen different times, and is known as the Chinese Mandela. They sat in a small congressional hearing room last week and spoke about an astonishing reality in China that I rise to reflect on today. It involves the execution of prisoners on an extraordinary and widespread scale, and the harvest and sale of prisoner human organs; and I am going to speak about what the heartfelt response of the American people ought to be.

It was just 64 years ago that the Nazi propaganda machine flaunted the Olympic Games coming to Munich and used that backdrop of legitimacy to launch the execution of 6 million Jews. In 1980, the Soviet Union touted the decision to have the Olympic Games in Moscow, and on the very eve of those Olympic Games launched its barbarous war against Afghanistan.

Now, as we look at the 2008 Olympic Games headed for Beijing, China, we are reminded of promises by that Communist regime to build eight new stadiums to prepare for the contestants. What they do not say is they have been using the older stadiums to stage sentencing rallies and to publicly condemn prisoners to death. Prisoners are brought to the stadiums, as we learned

last week, held in leg irons where audiences are required to watch their sentencing as a lesson in obedience to the law and government; and after the show, prisoners are paraded off to a firing squad. It is frightening and medieval stuff.

China today executes more people than all other countries in the world combined, according to Amnesty International, some 20,000 executions over the last decade, an average of 40 people a week; and that is just what is public, Mr. Speaker. Not only are they engaged in the moral horror of widespread public summary executions, but also China is in the business of carefully executing persons and then quickly harvesting prisoners' organs for sale on the international market. We heard from State Department officials who even acknowledged this.

It is an extraordinary thing, to say the least. The practice of taking human organs from condemned prisoners is in itself condemned by every known standard of medical ethics in the civilized world, and it goes on with American and Western customers paying top dollar for those organs each and every day.

I call on the United States of America and our State Department, as I did in the congressional hearing, to act in a number of ways, to issue a warning through HHS and the CDC to American citizens who are traveling abroad to the Asian Pacific Rim of not only the dangers of obtaining a human organ, but of the profound immorality of doing so. It is imperative that the United States of America speak in moral terms of that which is immoral, and it is immoral to harvest organs from condemned prisoners.

I also challenge the administration to rethink this entire business of engagement and to do as Ronald Reagan did whenever his administration did visit the Evil Empire, the Soviet Union. They met with dissidents; they associated themselves with people who were advancing freedom. The Good Book tells us, I am a friend to those who fear you, and so the United States should be to the Chinese people, a friend to those who cherish liberty and cherish the sanctity of human life and condemn the outrage of mass executions and the harvesting of human organs.

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

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

HONORING GEORGE GARCIA

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

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to honor a dear friend from my

district, George Garcia, who died early this morning at the age of 51. He was a resident of El Sereno community of East Los Angeles in my district. He was born on May 6, 1952, in Los Angeles and grew up in the community of Chino, California.

At the age of 18, George Garcia answered our Nation's call to duty and voluntarily enlisted in the United States Army. He was signed to the 82nd Airborne Division, where he served with great honor during the Vietnam War. In Vietnam, George served as a "tunnel rat." I asked my colleagues what is a tunnel rat. Apparently these young men in that era courageously dug tunnels behind enemy lines in the Vietnam War.

Upon returning from Vietnam, George married his high school sweetheart, Roberta Melendez. Together, they raised three beautiful children who mourn his loss today, as well as myself and other people from our community. One of his children, George, Jr., is carrying on his father's commitment to defending our Nation as a member of the United States Navy.

Upon returning from Vietnam, George Garcia dedicated his life and career to helping fellow veterans. For the past 25 years, he worked as an employee of the Employment Development Department in California finding jobs for unemployed veterans.

□ 2045

He founded the San Gabriel Valley East Los Angeles Veterans Employment Committee. He also fought vigorously to address the special needs of Latino veterans, including immigration, substance abuse and education training. George also formed coalitions among multi-ethnic groups and gave numerous hours to grassroots organizing to ensure a voice for his fellow veterans.

Most recently, George dedicated his time and expertise to military families who were waiting to hear about their loved ones who are currently serving in Iraq. He spent many, many years helping us each year provide gifts to poor children during Christmastime in the communities of East Los Angeles. Throughout his life, George Garcia gave unselfishly to his fellow veterans and their families. The imprint of his efforts can be felt throughout the Los Angeles community, and we all grieve for him today.

His commitment to serving his fellow veterans earned him in 2002 the honor of being named the State of California's Veteran of the Year by the Department for Veterans Outreach Programs in the State of California.

Whenever there was an event or a project to help veterans, George was there. I met him years ago as a State Senator in California. Every time I would ask him, what can we do to help the veterans, what can we do to help the homeless veterans, he was there giving his ideas, sharing with his heart and his compassion, tirelessly as a vol-

unteer, no pay, but out of the love of his heart.

I want to ask all my colleagues here to join me in honoring a true American hero. To him and his family, his son and to all those people and all those veterans, homeless veterans who met and touched him, he touched their hearts and he touches our hearts every day. We will remember you, George. We love you. God bless you.

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

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

QUESTIONS CONCERNING IRAQI WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the White House has been backtracking on how it was that fraudulent intelligence information was included by the President in his January State of the Union address delivered in this Chamber. Specifically, the statement by President Bush was that Iraq had sought to buy processed uranium for weapons of mass destruction from Niger, Africa. That information was wrong. Indeed, the documents involved appear to contain forged signatures of leaders from those nations who are no longer in office. How could this kind of information be placed in a State of the Union address?

The current Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, Mr. George Tenet, over the weekend has claimed publicly that he will take responsibility for this serious statement that misled Congress, misled the American people and indeed the people of the world about Iraq's intentions and capabilities relative to nuclear weaponry. The real question about this revelation is who exactly knew what and when did they know it? And who is responsible for these words being included in the President's State of the Union address, an address of such major proportion that preceded the invasion?

At the same time as I ponder these questions as I know the American people are, I am in receipt of a letter from an intelligence officer. I have read it and reread it and reread it again. In the letter and in my dealings with intelligence officers, I have been told that they are trained to triple-check, to verify significant intelligence information, triple-check. So when a statement is made in the State of the Union address of such consequence, I ask myself, was it triple-checked? Who really knew what and when did they know it? Surely someone, more than one person in that White House and other places checked and rechecked and then