

Daniel Nathans, (1978, Medicine) Johns Hopkins.

Doug Osheroff, (1996, Physics) Stanford.

Har Gobind Khorana, (1968, Medicine) MIT.

Herbert Hauptman, (1985, Chemistry) Hauptman-Woodward Medical Research Institute.

John C. Harsanyi, (1994, Economics) UC Berkeley.

Paul Berg, (1980, Chemistry) Stanford.

Henry Kendall, (1990, Physics) MIT.

Paul Samuelson, (1970, Economics) MIT.

James Tobin, (1981, Economics) Yale.

Jerome Friedman, (1990, Physics) MIT.

Sidney Altman, (1989, Chemistry) Yale.

Robert F. Curl, (1996, Chemistry) Rice.

William Sharpe, (1990, Economics) Stanford.

Merton Miller, (1990, Economics) U. of Chicago.

REFORM PARTY
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Dallas, TX, November 4, 1997.

Hon. CHRISTOPHER S. BOND,
Russell Building, Senate Office Building, U.S.
Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR BOND: I want to thank you personally for having the courage and integrity to oppose the Patent Bill now pending before Congress—Senate Bill 507. This Bill will destroy our patent system and remove all incentives for people to create revolutionary new products.

In addition, I would like to thank Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott for standing on principle and refusing to allow this bill to be sneaked through the Senate without hearings or debate.

Obviously, some members of the Senate feel that the owners of the country—the people—have no right to know what Congress is doing.

Under this law, inventors' new products still pending approval, will be made available to all nations, with many countries shamelessly mass-producing these products and ignoring the inventors' rights.

The only recourse for the inventor is to petition the newly created World Trade Organization, where our country only has one unweighted—and believe it or not, the inventor has no recourse in the United States court system. Does anybody really think that this complies with our Constitution?

Granting patent rights to inventors is a Constitutional right—clearly spelled out in our Constitution in Article I, Section 8.

Please remind every member of Congress that it is illegal to amend the Constitution by passing laws.

The only way the Constitution can be amended is through the amendment process. Isn't this a whole lot better than leaving it up to the lobbyists, foreign governments, and corporations? The framers of the Constitution knew what they were doing. Let's follow the rules.

Congress has no business even thinking about circumventing the Constitution with a combination of federal law and international trade agreements.

What would our country and the world be like today if Robert Fulton had not invented the steam engine, Thomas Edison had not invented the electric light, Alexander Graham Bell had not invented the telephone and made instant worldwide communication possible, The Wright brothers had not invented the airplane, Edwin Armstrong had not harnessed the airways and made radio and television possible, Jack Kilby and Robert Noyce had not invented the integrated circuit, just to mention a few.

A few years ago two young men, Ralph Lagergren and Mark Underwood, from Kansas had revolutionary ideas about how to improve the combine used to harvest grain. They had great ideas, but no money.

Using their brains, wits, and creativity as a substitute for money, they successfully created this new product and now hold over 25 patents.

John Deere purchased the technologies and patent rights for several million dollars.

I had the privilege of showing 4,000 Future Farmers of America a videotape of their great work. These teenagers were electrified, because Ralph's and Mark's success made these young people realize that it is still possible to dream great dreams in America and make those dreams come true.

Can't we agree that inventors should not have their Constitutional rights violated and they should be paid for their creative ideas and inventions?

Patent rights and the creativity and ingenuity of United States inventors have been instrumental in giving the United States our world leadership.

Why is this happening? Because our large corporations, foreign governments, and foreign companies who contributed millions of dollars to the 1996 political campaigns want to steal our inventors' new patents. If you question this statement, get a list of the companies working to lobby this change through Congress.

Patents are property rights under U.S. Law. It is immoral and inexcusable for large corporations to band together and spend a fortune trying to lobby this Bill secretly through Congress, so that the creative ideas of United States inventors can literally be stolen.

Why don't these people admit that what they are trying to get done is no better than robbing a bank. In fact, it is even worse to steal an individual's inventions so that companies can increase corporate profits.

If this is such a good idea, why has this whole process been carried out behind closed doors in Congress, with people supporting this Bill doing everything they can to avoid public debates on the floor of the House and Senate?

The answer it is cannot stand the harsh light of public scrutiny.

I want to thank you and every member of the House and Senate who have stood up to the tremendous pressure you are subjected to. I know that many of you have been threatened about what the special interests will do to you in the next election. You are living Commodore Maury's words—"When principle is involved, be deaf to expediency."

Just let these people know that all the special interest money in the world is not worth one penny unless it will buy the votes of the American people. I, and millions of other Americans who share your concerns over Constitutional rights and protecting our inventors' great new ideas, will be working night and day to see that people who have the character and integrity to stand up to this tremendous pressure are overwhelmingly re-elected.

I challenge the people supporting this Bill to come out of the closet, face the American people, and have an open debate on this issue, but I won't hold my breath waiting for them to do it. That is not the way they operate, and they will all be embarrassed if they attempt to do it.

I will pay for the television time to allow a national debate on this issue. The only problem we will have is that the people who are for this Bill will not show up, because it cannot withstand the light of public scrutiny, and they will pressure the television networks not to sell the time.

If this Bill passes, A Constitutional lawsuit will be filed immediately. Foreign nations and corporations will know that the 21st Century pirates for hire reside in the U.S. Congress. Those who vote for it will be paid off handsomely. The people who voted for it

will be forced to defend their actions in their 1998 campaigns. It will be a major Constitutional violation issue in the 2000 campaigns.

Isn't it time for our elected officials to stop debating whether their actions are legal or illegal, and ask only one question, "Is it right or wrong?"

Finally, before voting for this Bill, ask every member of the House and Senate who plan to vote for this Bill, to read the words of Isaac Hull, Captain of the U.S.S. Constitution, Old Ironsides—"If that fellow wants a fight, we won't disappoint him."

Again, thank you for your leadership—thank you for your courage—thank you for standing on principle.

Sincerely,

ROSS PEROT.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 17, 1997]

A BAD PATENT BILL

The Senate is considering a misguided bill to recast the patent laws in ways that would threaten small inventors and dampen the innovative spirit that helps sustain America's economy. The bill is so mischievous that it has attracted an unusual coalition of opponents—including the icon of liberal economists, Paul Samuelson, the icon of conservative economists, Milton Friedman, and 26 other Nobel Prize-winning scientists and economists.

Patent laws currently require inventors to disclose their secrets in return for the exclusive right to market their product for up to 20 years. Early disclosure helps the economy by putting new ideas immediately into the hands of people who, for a fee to the patent holder, find novel and commercially applicable uses for these ideas. Extended protection, meanwhile, provides a huge incentive for inventors to keep inventing. The American system generates more and better patent applications than any other country's.

The Senate bill would weaken patent protection for small inventors by requiring inventors who file for both American and foreign patents to publish their secrets 18 months after filing rather than when the patent is issued. Small inventors say that premature publication gives away their secret if their application fails. It would also allow large corporations with the financial muscle to fend off subsequent legal challenges to maneuver around the patent even if it is later issued.

Worse, the bills would encourage corporations to avoid the patent process altogether. Under current law, companies that rely on unpatented trade secrets run the risk that someone else will patent their invention and charge them royalties. The Senate bill would permit companies whose trade secrets are later patented by someone else to continue to market their products without paying royalties. Encouraging corporations to hide secrets is the opposite of what an economy that relies on information needs.

Pesky patent holders do in fact get in the way of large corporations. But the economy thrives on independent initiative. Small inventors need ironclad patent protection so that they are not forced into a legal scrum with financial giants. The House of Representatives and the Senate Judiciary Committee approved the patent bill without hearing the country's leading economists and scientists make their case. Senate sponsors now say they will try. Congress needs to hear the critics out before proceeding to any more votes. •

CONNECTICUT TEACHER OF THE YEAR

• Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise today to offer congratulations to an

outstanding mathematics teacher, Marianne Roche Cavanaugh, who has been named the 1998 Connecticut Teacher of the Year. Mrs. Cavanaugh has demonstrated a lifetime of dedication to the students of Glastonbury's Public Schools, and she has set a standard of excellence for both her students and other educators. I want to express my gratitude and admiration for the commitment that she has displayed over her 22 years in teaching.

Mrs. Cavanaugh has had a distinguished career marked with various awards and achievements. She single-handedly created the Gideon Wells Marathon—an academic and community involvement program for 7th and 8th graders. Since 1994, students have raised more than \$20,000 by securing pledges for each math problem they solve in 1 hour during the Marathon. The accumulated funds have been donated to charities chosen by the students. In addition, Mrs. Cavanaugh has directed district-wide professional development, and has co-developed a problem solving math curriculum, which emphasizes writing, calculator use, problem solving, and interdisciplinary activities. Imaginative and productive ideas such as these have earned Mrs. Cavanaugh the distinction of being a finalist for the prestigious Presidential Award for Excellence in Mathematics and Science Teaching in both 1986 and 1998, as well as being the winner of the Celebration of Excellence Award in 1986.

The purpose of the Connecticut Teacher of the Year Program is to identify, from among many outstanding teachers, one teacher to serve as a visible and vocal representative of what is best in the profession. Through her innovative ideas, dedication to the institutional development of mathematics, and love for her profession and her students, Mrs. Cavanaugh has clearly earned this prestigious honor.

While I commend Mrs. Cavanaugh for her display of excellence in teaching, I want also to mention that her work is representative of the work of many educators that too often remain unrecognized. A survey done by the National Center for Education Statistics in 1995 found that only 54 percent of all teachers feel respected by society in their profession. Teachers fill an enormously important role in shaping the developmental experiences of children during the impressionable ages of childhood and adolescence. They serve not only to educate, but to mentor, motivate, influence, and inspire our children. Thanks to Mrs. Cavanaugh and other quality teachers like her throughout the State and the Nation, we have a brighter future ahead of us.●

THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE GREAT LAKES WATER QUALITY AGREEMENT

• Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, this year marks the 25th anniversary of the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement,

which has united Canada and the United States in their dedication to protecting the biological, chemical, and physical integrity of the Great Lakes. The commitment of both countries to manage water quality on an ecosystem basis has been so successful that other regions often praise our accomplishments and strive to achieve the same high quality of management. I applaud the efforts of both countries in the last 25 years to achieve the goals set forth in the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement and urge that they continue to work cooperatively to maintain and improve Great Lakes water quality during the next 25 years.

On April 15, 1972, the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement was signed by President Richard Nixon and Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau as a binational pledge to reduce and prevent pollution in the Great Lakes. The impetus for this agreement was the deteriorated quality of the Great Lakes into which we discharged our untreated wastes. In fact, Lake Erie was declared dead because of its poor quality and the Cuyahoga River had even caught fire. Lake Erie and Lake Ontario suffered from high phosphorus loadings which caused excessive amounts of algae to grow and deplete the water of oxygen. Low oxygen levels in the lakes caused fish to die. Other contaminants discharged into the water entered the food chain and caused deformities in the fish and wildlife of the region.

The initial agreement concentrated on reducing phosphorus and pollutants entering our lakes through municipal and industrial discharges. As a result of the 1972 Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement, phosphorus levels significantly decreased in the Great Lakes. In Lake Erie and Ontario, phosphorus loadings have been reduced by almost 80 percent. The United States and Canada achieved this binational goal through improvements in sewage treatment, lowering the levels of phosphorus in detergents, and reducing agricultural runoff.

While significant improvements were being made in controlling phosphorus and other wastewater discharges, researchers showed that toxic substances were a major concern. Persistent toxic substances, such as DDT, DDE, mercury, and PCB's, bioaccumulate in organisms and increase in concentration up the food chain. Some substances have been shown to cause birth defects in wildlife and adverse health effects in humans.

As a result, the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement was revised in 1978 to meet the challenge of controlling toxics and included an ecosystem approach to managing the water quality of the Great Lakes basin. The two countries committed themselves to achieving zero discharge of toxic substances in toxic amounts and the virtual elimination of persistent toxic substances.

Due to the United States and Canadian commitment to reduce toxic sub-

stances releases, some major strides have been accomplished. The cormorant population in the Great Lakes region has significantly increased from 1950's to 1970's levels when the number of nesting pairs of cormorants dropped by 86 percent. Between 1971 and 1989, concentrations of DDE and PCB's decreased in cormorant eggs by more than 80 percent.

An additional refinement of the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement occurred with the 1987 protocol which reinforced the 1978 commitments of the two countries and highlighted the importance of human and aquatic ecosystem health. Provisions were added to clean up 42 local areas of concern in the Great Lakes and included the development and implementation of remedial action plans [RAP's] and lakewide management plans.

A challenge to controlling pollutants entering the Great Lakes exists since toxics and other pollutants enter the system in numerous ways. Therefore, the 1987 protocol also focused on nonpoint source pollution, contaminated sediments, airborne toxic substances, and contaminated groundwater.

Since the 1987 protocol, accomplishments have been made in the areas of concern. In 1994, Collingwood Harbour, ON, attained its restoration goals. The community worked together to insure that the contaminated sediments and deteriorated fish and wildlife habitats were dealt with in an innovative and cost-effective manner. On our side of the border, a fish consumption advisory was lifted for the first time in two decades at Waukegan Harbor, IL, in February of this year. The harbor is an area of concern which has been undergoing remediation efforts to clean up the largest known-concentration of PCB's and PCB contaminated sediments.

Though toxic substances continue to pollute the Great Lakes and threaten the health of humans and wildlife, there also have been accomplishments in controlling some toxics. For instance, concentrations of polychlorinated compounds, such as dioxins and furans which are used in the bleaching process of pulp and paper mills, have decreased in the Great Lakes by 90 percent since the late 1980's.

While improvements in Great Lakes water quality are evident, they have not come quickly enough nor have they addressed all facets of the problem. Moreover, the most difficult challenge laid out by the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement is still before us—the virtual elimination of persistent toxic substances. Much more work needs to be done in this arena. Fortunately, the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement is precisely the vehicle which will enable us to rise to the challenge of virtually eliminating persistent toxic substances in the Great Lakes. Though crafted 25 years ago, the agreement and its amendments remain, in its current form, a vital road