

bill authorizes the importation of generic medicines when the U.S. patent holder cannot make enough medicine to meet domestic public health needs, and removes a trade policy barrier to such imports.

The prospect of an avian flu pandemic has gripped health officials around the world. Part of the response would involve treating victims with drugs to lessen the spread of the flu virus. The World Health Organization has urged all nations to stockpile reserves of antiviral flu drugs, and the Infectious Diseases Society of America has recommended that the United States stockpile enough drugs to treat 25 to 40 percent of the population.

The drug believed to be most effective against the flu is Tamiflu. The exclusive right in the United States to manufacture Tamiflu is owned by Roche, a pharmaceutical manufacturer based in Switzerland.

As Health and Human Services Secretary Michael Leavitt testified before the Energy and Commerce Committee on November 8, Roche has insufficient manufacturing capacity in the U.S. to meet the stockpile needs. At its maximum production, Roche could only produce 13 million treatment courses by the end of this year, far short of the 75 million we need to treat 25 percent of the population.

If Roche does not voluntarily license other companies to produce Tamiflu, the U.S. government has the authority to issue compulsory licenses to gain access to other sources of production of the drug. India, Taiwan, China, Thailand, Malaysia, Vietnam, the Philippines, South Korea and Argentina are among the countries considering plans to manufacture versions of Tamiflu to prepare for a possible flu pandemic.

However, Americans facing a pandemic today could not get anti-flu drugs from those countries, because in 2003 the U.S. Trade Representative agreed to make the U.S. ineligible to import drugs produced abroad under compulsory licenses.

World Trade Organization rules allow for countries with "insufficient" manufacturing capacity in the pharmaceutical sector to import pharmaceutical products produced under a compulsory license in other countries in order to meet public health needs. This authority is contained in paragraph 6 of the 2001 "Doha Declaration" on Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) and public health. The August 30, 2003, decision of the WTO TRIPS Council spelled out implementation of this authority.

At the urging of U.S. negotiators, the August 30 decision created an "opt out" list, whereby countries could voluntarily agree not to use the import authority. The U.S. is on the "opt out" list. Therefore, we find ourselves in a situation where the United States government voluntarily restricted its access to critical drugs to fight a pandemic. That makes no sense.

The solution is simple. We can "opt in" to the system. That is what my bill does. It directs the U.S. Trade Representative to notify the WTO that the U.S. declares itself an "opt in" country and thus eligible to import drugs made under compulsory licenses in order to meet public health needs. It also affirms that the President has the authority to import such drugs in such cases, as long as the drugs are approved by the Food and Drug Administration.

Americans should have the comfort of knowing that if the public needs a particular

drug to stop an avian flu pandemic, the U.S. government will have access to all available production sources for the drug. My bill would make sure that our government can do what it takes to combat an avian flu pandemic or other health emergency.

CONGRATULATIONS TO CHAIRMAN
DAVE HOBSON

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 18, 2005

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Chairman DAVE HOBSON (R-OH) for his bold, principled stance to eliminate federal funding for the bunker buster bomb. It was a major victory for the United States and the world.

This achievement means the United States will send the message of responsibility to other nations who are considering building nuclear weapons. The United States can continue to advocate for the Non-Proliferation Treaty, whereby the United States and other nuclear powers pledged to disarm in return for other nations not seeking nuclear weapons. Because nuclear bunker-busters would be seen as tactical nuclear weapons, the development of these weapons would make it more difficult to encourage Russia to dispose of its arsenal of over 4,000 tactical nuclear weapons. Chairman HOBSON has given the United States more clout to pressure Russia to eliminate its tactical nuclear weapons.

Again, I commend Chairman HOBSON for his defense of our Nation.

[From the Columbus Dispatch, November 13, 2005

HOBSON WILL KEEP BUSTING NUCLEAR
WEAPON

(By Jonathan Riskind)

The battle of the bunker buster, round two, goes to Rep. David L. Hobson.

But the Springfield Republican isn't so sure the Bush administration, especially Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld and others in the defense community, has given up on building a nuclear-tipped missile able to penetrate underground bunkers.

This is a saga last visited in this space a year ago. Then, too, Hobson, as chairman of the House Appropriation Committee's energy and water subcommittee, successfully fought the administration's push to build a specialized tactical nuclear weapon.

Pursuing new nuclear weapons when the United States is pushing nonproliferation around the world is wrong headed and dangerous, Hobson believes. And he's been told by scientists and candid members of the military that a nuclear bunker buster is likely to kill many innocent people and inflict such harm on the environment that no president would "OK" its use.

So Hobson refused to include \$4 million Rumsfeld wanted in the 2006 energy bill for bunker-buster research.

Hobson's counterpart in the Senate is Pete Domenici of New Mexico, who chairs the Senate Appropriation Committee's energy subcommittee. Domenici favors going ahead with the research, but he told the Albuquerque Tribune that the administration has abandoned its plans for a nuclear bunker buster. He said that, however, after Hobson won the fight; the final 2006 House-Senate agreement on a \$30.5 billion energy and water bill being sent to the White House reflects Hobson's views.

So while it's "over in my bill for this year," Hobson said, his attention is focused on whether the Defense Department will try to include bunker-buster money in the still-pending 2006 defense-spending bill.

"I have to watch in the defense bill to try and make sure they don't go around me," said Hobson, who is a senior member of the defense-spending subcommittee.

This is one example of how public policy is enmeshed in the fabric of the annual spending bills. Hobson's measure, for instance, tackles the post-Katrina issue of improving the efficiency with which the Army Corps of Engineers spends the money Congress doles out to it, though part of the solution is making sure lawmakers don't tie the corps' hands with a plethora of pet projects. One tack seen in the energy and water spending bills is to limit the ability of the corps to take money intended for one project and spend it on another, only to later come back and request yet more money for the first project. Hobson also hopes the bill will force the corps to do more long-term planning and to do a better job moving projects along.

He cites a dam on the Ohio River between Illinois and Kentucky that was authorized by Congress in 1988 at an estimated cost of \$775 million over about eight years. Completion is now scheduled for 2015, at a revised estimated cost of \$1.4 billion.

"We're trying to bring some business management to the way the corps conducts business," Hobson said.

But the most far-reaching policy platform in Hobson's bill amounts to a nuclear non-proliferation stand that bucks the notoriously stubborn Rumsfeld.

"We had a meeting and he made his views known and I made my views known," Hobson said. "He said there will be another day. I don't think they've given up."

But Hobson vowed to defuse the bunker-buster proposals for as long as he's a committee chairman. He has three more years to head the energy subcommittee before chairman term limits set in, and intends to run for re-election to a ninth term next year and serve all three of those years.

"They aren't changing my mind," Hobson said. "It is bad foreign policy to build a new type of nuclear weapon at the same time you are telling everyone else in the world, don't you do it."

INTELLIGENCE FAILURE AND
MANIPULATION

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 18, 2005

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, today I and my Democratic colleagues on the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence publicly discussed a critical item of unfinished business for this House—specifically, the need for the committee to undertake a detailed examination of the Iraq weapons of mass destruction (WMD) intelligence failure.

We need to undertake this inquiry because this is not the last time that we will need intelligence that's based on good methods, critical thinking—in fact, skeptical thinking that really looks at the uncertainties in the intelligence.

We have to learn to get this right. There will be other times when we need it.

Now, the President has said that those who are raising questions about the war in Iraq and how we got there are trying to rewrite history. Actually, that's not true. History is not being

rewritten. History cannot be written because no one has allowed the facts to be assembled.

That is what we are talking about here. We have tried, but we have been blocked repeatedly in our attempts to do so.

This matter is of critical importance. And it is, of course, ironic that at a time when we are fighting a war in the name of democracy and the freedoms, including freedom of speech and freedom of inquiry, that here we are stymied in our freedom of inquiry.

And it is freedom of inquiry not for political points or our personal curiosity. It is so that we can, for the future, have an intelligence system that is based on critical thinking, skeptical thinking and good methods. That is the point.

Let me just say that the line that we hear is, "There is not much that needs to be investigated, there is not much need for oversight, because you knew all this all along. And furthermore, it is unpatriotic."

It is unimportant, and yet if you ask for it, you are unpatriotic. I say to my friends on the other side of the aisle, you can't have it both ways.

I wish I could say that the refusal to investigate the Iraq intelligence failure is an isolated case. It is not.

For over 2 years, I've pressed this House to investigate how it was that the name and cover status of a serving CIA Clandestine Services officer made its way from the CIA to the White House political office and thence to the press.

Eight separate times in eight separate votes, the leadership of this Congress shut down any effort to get the information about the release of the identity of an intelligence employee. Conducting oversight of this matter is something that is central to our responsibility to look after the wellbeing and effectiveness of those people that we ask to take risks for us around the world.

Yet in eight separate votes, it was shut down.

Mr. Speaker, it's time—indeed well past time—for this Congress to do its job and conduct oversight of these and other intelligence matters. We cannot protect our Nation from future threats if we do not learn the full lessons of conflicts past, and this is especially critical in the realm of intelligence. I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to join us in this effort.

HONORING THE GARLAND
LAKESIDE ROTARY CLUB

HON. JEB HENSARLING

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 18, 2005

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to help celebrate two significant anniversaries of Rotary International. This year, Rotary International celebrated its 100th anniversary. From its humble roots in Chicago, Illinois, Rotary has grown into a worldwide organization of business and professional leaders who provide humanitarian service, encourage high ethical standards in all vocations, and help build goodwill and peace in the world. Since 1943, Rotary International has distributed more than \$1.1 billion to combat Polio, promote cultural exchanges and encourage community service.

I also want to recognize the Garland Lakeside Rotary Club for their 30 years of service to Dallas County. Throughout its history, the Garland Lakeside Rotary Club has achieved great success in carrying out the mission of Rotary International.

The Garland Lakeside Rotary Club is in the process of raising funds and building a medical clinic called the Friendship House. In the past they have supported local charities, including the Salvation Army and the YMCA. Each year they work with Garland Independent School District to provide underprivileged children with Christmas gifts.

Through these initiatives, the Garland Lakeside Rotary Club exemplifies the values of service and charity that lie at the heart of American society. As the Congressional representative of the members of this outstanding organization, it is my distinct pleasure to honor them today on the floor of the United States House of Representatives.

DEFICIT REDUCTION ACT OF 2005

SPEECH OF

HON. CAROLYN C. KILPATRICK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 17, 2005

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, some of the cuts proposed in this "Deficit Reduction Act" include Medicaid, student loans, child support enforcement, child foster care, supplemental security income, farm conservation, and many more.

Republicans have offered over \$50 billion in cuts to much needed programs for America's families. The pretext of these program cuts is to bring down the deficit, but all they do is offset the cost of a \$56.6 billion tax cut package that will come to the floor of the House soon. Do not be misled into believing that the budget cuts being contemplated are to cover the cost of rebuilding the Gulf Coast states. They are being used to offset the raid that is taking place on the Treasury.

The Republicans are employing a two-pronged strategy for this fiscal charade. Today they want us to vote on \$50 billion in spending cuts and later they will ask us to vote on a \$50 billion tax cut for the wealthiest top one-tenth of one percent of Americans. It is their hope that the American people will not see the connection between the two actions. Show the people that you are cutting spending on one hand; then cut taxes for your supporters with the other. That is their game. I am appalled the Republicans will cut programs for children, the hungry, the sick and the vulnerable for tax cuts to the healthiest and wealthiest Americans.

Since 2001, the Republicans have done an excellent job of spinning their tax cut packages. They said we could have it all: Medicare prescription drug coverage, the War on Terrorism, huge tax cuts, and still produce budget surpluses as far as the eye can see. It is a great pitch, but there is only one hitch to their argument: it did not happen that way. Now Republicans are doing all they can to dodge the responsibility for the fiscal situation in which the country now finds itself. In fact, the President and my Republican colleagues take pride that last year's budget deficit was \$320 billion, the third largest deficit in history. They

take it as a record of accomplishment that the deficit was not higher. Now that is spin. Last year's deficit may be lower than the \$412 billion deficit reached in fiscal year 2004, but that hardly entitles the Republicans to bragging rights over their fiscal stewardship. Under their leadership, a Republican president and Republican Congress have produced a string of record setting budget deficits.

By bringing this bill to the floor, the folk on the other side of the aisle have the temerity to say that the program cuts being recommended will offset the cost of added spending for Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. That argument is not even close to the truth. That is budgeteering by Merlin the Magician. I hope the American people will be able to look behind the curtain of their arguments and see them for what they are: simply a means to hide from their record of fiscal irresponsibility.

The President and the Republican majority are adept. Record deficits? Not the fault of the party in power. Blame 9/11, or blame the economy, or blame Katrina, or blame Saddam Hussein and Iraq, or blame the terrorists, or blame whatever. Just do not blame the Republicans or the Republican tax cuts for the horrible financial situation our country is in. That is the gist of the Republican message we hear today.

For a President and a party that is artful in avoiding blame for the country's fiscal state, for the failure to execute a successful war strategy in Iraq, the failure to respond rapidly during Hurricane Katrina, the failure to catch Osama bin Laden, the failure to find weapons of mass destruction, the failure to provide affordable energy, the failure to hire competent people to handle crises, the failure to prepare for a possible bird flu pandemic, for all the failures that have occurred on the watch of this President and this Republican Congress, can there be little reason why they want to avoid the "blame game?"

We can do better. There is no reason why we freely spend to rebuild Baghdad but struggle to rebuild Biloxi. When it comes to taking care of our own, where is the parity? Why are we applying a tougher standard on our own than we are in Afghanistan and Iraq? The budget cuts that will be triggered under this bill violates the principle of parity, it puts the welfare of others ahead of our own American people. This budget is symbolic of the spending priorities of this administration: It puts America and Americans last. That is a shame and that is why this bill does not deserve our support. I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in voting down this unfortunate bill.

CONDEMNING TERRORIST
ATTACKS IN JORDAN

SPEECH OF

HON. ALLYSON Y. SCHWARTZ

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 16, 2005

Mrs. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 456, a resolution to vehemently condemn the terrorist attacks that occurred in Amman, Jordan.

On November 9, 2005, hundreds of innocent Jordanians gathered to celebrate a wedding ceremony—one of the greatest tributes to