

the installation of a revolutionary theocratic government like that of Iran. Such a government will most certainly be anti-democratic and inherently repressive. Those who desire such a government do not have the support of the majority of Iraqis.

The foreign fighters and transnational terrorists can be divided into two categories: the first is al Qaeda. The second is made up of disparate radicalized Islamic groups. We know what the objectives of al Qaeda are, as September 11 so clearly demonstrated. It wishes to drag the Muslim world into a war against the West. The other foreign fighters are recruited by radicalized clerics and have a similar vision of international jihad.

The criminal elements in Iraq are undeniably part of the insurgency. While many thousands were unjustly persecuted in prisons under the Hussein regime, many prisoners were also legitimately criminals. Before the war began, Saddam Hussein saw fit to release a large number of these criminals to prey upon his own people. They form part of those opposing the legitimate government and the coalition forces.

Mr. Speaker, the follow-up question that many opponents of the war fail to ask is, Why do these insurgents hate us?

Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question is clear and straightforward. Our opponents hate us, the coalition, not because of what we do, but because of who we are. We represent individual liberty and democracy, two values that our terrorist opponents neither understand nor accept.

If we take the time to examine each of these four insurgent groups, we will find their opposition to the coalition is built upon a rejection of individual liberty and democratic pluralism. The Baathists, of course, have never supported freedom or true democracy. Thirty years of their regime amply demonstrated they believe in an Iraq ruled by a strongman like Saddam Hussein and plundered by his Fascist followers.

The radical fundamentalists for their part certainly do not believe in either freedom or democracy, unlike their mainstream Muslim brethren. They clearly support a regime ruled by a religiously radical minority. In this regime there will be no place for freedom or democracy.

Al Qaeda, of course, will never stop hating us and despises the principles which we believe are essential to Iraq's future. The other foreign fighters also aim to create a state that will pursue a permanent jihad against the West. This jihad is antithetical to values like freedom and democracy.

Finally, the criminal element of the Iraqi opposition is also opposed to the principles of freedom and democracy precisely because these principles do not empower them.

The great weakness of all these opposition groups, Saddamists, transnational terrorists, theocrats, and

common criminals, is that none of them offer an attractive future for the Iraqi people. None of these groups could compete in open elections or attain power in a genuine democracy. That is why they so fiercely oppose our efforts to create a free Iraq based on individual liberty, tolerance, and democratic elections.

Mr. Speaker, our President is right: the key to victory in the war against terror is the spread of freedom and democracy throughout the Middle East. Our own security is intimately linked to the success of democracy in this troubled part of the world. The success of democracy and self-government in Iraq is the crucial first step to transforming and liberating the Middle East. That is why we must succeed in this critical battle of the forces of oppression and terror in Iraq, and that is why the opponents of the war in Iraq are so badly mistaken in their criticism of our current efforts. Success in Iraq will make America safer.

Mr. Speaker, despite the claims of critics, we have made real and genuine advances in Iraq. No one can deny the significance of 16 new governing councils, 90 new district councils, 194 city or sub-district councils, and 445 neighborhood councils. Together these institutions allow millions of Iraqis to engage in local policy discussions for the first time in history. These are clear advances which will empower Iraqis to control their own destiny. Through building democratic and free institutions, Iraq will be free; and America will be safe.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my Special Order at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

#### REIMPORTATION OF DRUGS

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

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, just last week the American Association of Retired Persons released a study showing that drug prices rose in the last year by nearly 4 percent in the first quarter of last year, putting us on target for what has happened in the last 5 years every year in a row where the price of prescription drugs have risen on average 17 percent each year compounded, growing the cost for our senior citizens, their families that help their grandparents and parents to afford their drugs. And now that we have a prescription drug bill, it is going to also cost our taxpayers continuously more and more money to try to pay for that medication.

We have known for the last year prices were going to go up close to

about 17 percent; the year before that, 19 percent; the year before that, 20 percent; and the year before that, 18 percent, drug prices had gone up. We passed a prescription drug bill to try to deal with what seniors have said is the number one issue that affected them and their pocketbooks, which is that they could not afford the medications they need that their doctors were prescribing.

And let just take one step back. This Congress passed a prescription drug bill designed not with seniors in mind, but with HMOs and pharmaceutical companies. Just take their discount card for a second: all this press around a discount card the government was going to offer, 17 different plans. Some drugs covered, other drugs not covered. And some drugs, when they are covered, could get dropped a week later and people are locked into that plan.

Think about it. If one were designing a plan for senior citizens, if one were designing a plan for the customer, would they have designed that plan as is? No. The only reason that plan and the discount card was designed that way was because it was designed to help the pharmaceutical industry and the HMOs that had contributed over \$250 million in the last election cycle and hired over 900 lobbyists to lobby that bill. That bill was not designed with senior citizens in mind. It was not designed to try to save them money. That bill, that legislation and the discount card, was designed for the people who paid for it.

We have a piece of legislation that was passed here in the House that dealt with allowing people to do what people have been doing and senior citizens have been doing for the last 10 years, to buy the prescription drugs they need from Canada and Europe where prices are 30 to 80 percent cheaper than they are here in the United States, allowing, finally, the United States to have a free market where we have competition and prices come down due to competition.

I did a study on my Web site from Costco, a discount retailer in my district and a discount retailer in Toronto, Costco to Costco, Chicago to Toronto; and the prescription drugs and medications at the Costco in Toronto are 40 to 60 percent cheaper than they are in Chicago, the same medications that we can find on the shelves in Costco in Chicago as on the shelves at Costco in Toronto. And why is that? They have lower prices there. And senior citizens, 1 million to 2 million a year, go over the border to buy their medications that their doctors prescribe in Canada, saving themselves thousands upon thousands of dollars.

They can do it in Europe where they also provide medications. The same things, the same types of medications that our doctors prescribe here, they get at 50 percent cheaper.

Why would we force our senior citizens into higher prices and our taxpayers to pay higher prices to support

higher prices when we could allow the free market to finally operate?

I understand why the pharmaceutical industry would pay about 200-some-odd million dollars in the last year and would hire 900-plus lobbyists. They have got a sweet deal going. They should fight for the deal they got. But we here fought on behalf of the people who elected us. Eighty-eight Republicans and 153 Democrats in the House voted in favor of allowing reimportation, allowing people access to affordable medications at world-class prices because people from around the world come to America for their medical care; yet Americans are forced to go around the world for their medications. And we here in the House stood up to the special interests.

Later this week, the other body is going to take up that legislation. Having failed to deal with the number one issue of price and affordability of prescription drugs, they are now going to take up what we here in the House have done, which is allowing people the access to medications in Canada and in Europe where prices are much cheaper for the same name-brand drugs, name-brand drugs that we find in the shelves over there in Canada that we find here, but 30 to 80 percent cheaper.

They are going to take up that legislation because they now have spent months talking to constituents, doing town halls, and they have found out what senior citizens have been telling us for the last 6 years: they cannot afford the medications that their doctors are prescribing. They are forced to pick between the medications and their food. They are forced to give up their month to allow their spouse to buy their medications. They are forced into cutting pills in half.

It is time that we allow the free market to operate, bring competition to the pricing of prescription drugs and allow the prices to be driven down to world prices where they are 30 to 50 percent cheaper than they are here in the United States.

□ 1930

#### TRIBUTE TO VINCE DOOLEY

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

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Vince Dooley upon his retirement as Athletic Director at the University of Georgia. I could use the time to recite the countless achievements of this great Georgian as a Coach and Athletic Director, but I will not. Instead, I will submit for the RECORD a 4-page resume outlining Coach Dooley's lasting contributions to the University of Georgia.

I prefer to use this time telling America about the man who made such a difference in so many lives, including my own. I first met Coach Dooley in

1961, when he was the guest speaker at my high school banquet for our football team. He was the freshman coach at Auburn and friends with our coach, Jim Loftin. That night, he made a three-win team feel like national champions, just like Vince Dooley always did, always encouraging and always motivational.

Three years later, he arrived in Athens, Georgia, as the new football coach for the Georgia Bulldogs, and Athens would never be the same again. He took a three-win team from the previous year and molded it into a 7-3-1 team, defeating Georgia Tech and winning the Sun Bowl Championship over Texas Tech.

In the years to follow, Vince Dooley led Georgia to intersectional victories over Michigan, Texas, Notre Dame, UCLA and Michigan State. In his 25 years as head coach, he led the Bulldogs to six Southeastern Conference championships, 20 bowl games and the 1980 National Championship.

His tributes, however, do not lie in the trophies he collected, but rather in the lives he molded; men like Tommy Lawhorne, an undersized, over-achieving linebacker, now a leading surgeon in Columbus, Georgia; and Billy Payne, an all Southeastern Conference end, responsible for convincing the world to come to Georgia for the Centennial Olympic Games; or the greatest player ever to play for Georgia, or, I would submit, for any other university in the country, Hershel Walker. Only a coach like Vince Dooley could instill the character and humility for which Hershel is known.

There are thousands more I could mention. They may not be in a Hall of Fame, but they played for Vince Dooley. They all represent the character, humility and work ethic that Vince Dooley instilled in all that came his way. We know them as Bucky Kimsey, Clayton Foster, Fred Barber, Andy Johnson and Frank Ros. Their communities know them as leaders.

There is no greater tribute to a man's career than the success of those who learned under him. It is only fitting that the man replacing Vince Dooley as Athletic Director is Damon Evans, just one of many who played for Georgia's greatest coach, Vince Dooley.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE), the former national championship coach of the Nebraska Cornhuskers.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. It is a pleasure to be able to speak for a few minutes here on Vince Dooley.

I first met Vince in 1969, when he was coaching at the University of Georgia and I was an assistant coach at the University of Nebraska, and I was impressed by his humility, his willingness to talk to a lowly assistant coach. Of course, 24 years as a head coach and 25 years as Athletic Director is unprecedented. Many people say one year in

coaching is like a dog year, so Vince is about 175 years old by that figure.

I thought that Vince was just an excellent representative of college football. He was a leader in regard to the Rules Committee, he worked on the College Football Association, was a very good person as far as compromise, keeping people on an even keel, because sometimes things got a little heated.

Of course, Vince, I guess nobody knows for sure what his politics are, but his wife ran for Congress as a Democrat and then again as a Republican. So he obviously is a man who has a very even keel. I think Barbara was a great asset to Vince, they are a great team. Of course, Vince has been a tremendous asset to the University of Georgia, to college football, and, of course, the State of Georgia.

So it is a pleasure for me to have a couple of minutes to talk about Vince. We wish him well in his retirement.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the profile on Vince Dooley I referred to earlier.

VINCE DOOLEY

HEAD FOOTBALL COACH: 1964-1988; ATHLETIC DIRECTOR: 1979-2004

For the past 40 years, Vince Dooley has had an enduring impact on the University of Georgia, Southeastern Conference, and collegiate athletics across the country. He has been a man of great foresight in times of change, and vision in critical times that have shaped the path of college athletics. His national stature was reinforced when he was chosen from athletic leaders around the country to chair a national sportsmanship summit in the spring, 2003.

There is no stronger indicator of Georgia's overall athletic prominence than its recent success in the annual Sears Directors Cup which includes a second place finish in the 1998-99 season, third place finish in 2000-01, and top ten finishes in four of the past five years. Sears Directors Cup competition annually recognizes the top athletic programs in the country. Under his watch as athletic director (since 1979), Georgia teams have won 18 national championships (nine in the past five years) including an unprecedented four during the 1998-99 year (women's swimming, gymnastics, men's tennis, men's golf). Since Dooley became athletic director, Georgia athletic teams have also won 75 SEC team championships and numerous individual national titles in both men's and women's sports.

He has also been a standard-bearer for academic excellence. Under his leadership, more than 100 Georgia student-athletes have been named first team Academic All-America, 43 have received NCAA Post-Graduate Scholarships, seven have been named recipients of the SEC's Boyd McWhorter Scholar-Athlete of the Year award, seven NCAA Top Eight Award winners, three NCAA Woman of the Year recipients, and well over \$275,000 has been awarded to the University's general scholarship fund through performances by Georgia student-athletes.

In 1985, Dooley was also instrumental in fostering the pledge which has resulted in \$2 million being contributed by the Athletic Association to the University—the principle being used for non-athletic scholarships and the interest used in the recruitment of top students and other nonathletic programs. These funds also provided private matching