

are no longer needed, or that have completed their missions, totaled \$7.6 million. This reflects the termination of 47 committees, originally established under both congressional authorities or implemented by executive agency decisions. Agencies will continue to review and eliminate advisory committees that are obsolete, duplicative, or of a lesser priority than those that would serve a well-defined national interest. New committees will be established only when they are essential to the conduct of necessary business, are clearly in the public's best interests, and when they serve to enhance Federal decisionmaking through an open and collaborative process with the American people.

I urge the Congress to work closely with the General Services Administration and each department and agency to examine additional opportunities for strengthening the contributions made by Federal advisory committees.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 9, 2000.

RECESS OR ADJOURNMENT OF SENATE FROM MARCH 9, 2000 OR MARCH 10, 2000 UNTIL MARCH 20, 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following privileged Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 94) providing for recess or adjournment of the Senate from March 9, 2000, or March 10, 2000, until March 20, 2000, or second day after Members are notified.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 94

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That when the Senate recesses or adjourns at the close of business on Thursday, March 9, 2000, or Friday, March 10, 2000, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Monday, March 20, 2000, or until such time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Majority Leader of the Senate, after consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the Senate to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Senate concurrent resolution is concurred in.

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MARCH 13, 2000

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

HOURLY MEETING ON TUESDAY, MARCH 14, 2000

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday, March 13, 2000, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, March 14 for morning-hour debates.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

(Mr. WOLF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.)

PROPOSED SALE OF ATTACK HELICOPTERS TO TURKEY WOULD DESTABILIZE REGION, THREATEN HUMAN RIGHTS

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, the Clinton administration is currently considering a \$4 billion sale of attack helicopters to the Republic of Turkey. I am here tonight, Mr. Speaker, to express my strong opposition to this proposal.

Providing these helicopters to Turkey will only serve to increase tensions and instability in a region of the world that is vital to U.S. interests and which is already plagued by conflicts and human rights violations.

Put very simply, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that the Turkish Armed Forces will use this advanced American military technology to threaten its neighbors and abuse its own citizens.

Mr. Speaker, several organizations have called upon the Clinton administration to refuse an export license for the attack helicopters to the Turkish Army because Turkey has failed to

make progress on human rights benchmarks set by the administration in 1998 as a condition for approval of the export license.

Among those organizations working to block the export license is Amnesty International. Dr. William F. Schulz, Executive Director of Amnesty International USA, stated that, "Based on the State Department's own annual human rights report, Turkey fails to meet the human rights benchmarks."

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the section on Turkey in the State Department's annual human rights report issued just a few weeks ago states that, "The security forces continue to torture, beat, and otherwise abuse persons regularly. Torture, beatings, and other abuses by security forces remained widespread, at times resulting in deaths. Security forces at times beat journalists."

Mr. Speaker, in a particularly relevant issue with regard to the helicopters, both the State Department and Amnesty International have reported the use of helicopters to attack Kurdish villages in Turkey and to transport troops to regions where they have tortured and killed civilians.

Do we really want to see American advanced technology used by Turkey to accomplish these operations against the Kurdish people with even more ruthless efficiency?

Mr. Speaker, this helicopter deal is also a danger to regional stability in the Eastern Mediterranean and the Caucasus.

Recently there has been a thawing in Greek-Turkish relations, a trend which we all welcome. The sale of these helicopters to Turkey has the potential to upset this recent progress in the relations between these neighbors. It could well be seen by Greece as a destabilizing step at a time when we are seeking renewed efforts to resolve the Cyprus conflict, an issue that the administration considers a major priority.

In terms of Turkey's legitimate defense needs, it was hard to see any justification for these advanced attack helicopters. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that Turkey is already overarmed.

The neighboring country that has suffered the most from the Turkish Government's aggressive militaristic and nationalistic posture is Armenia. In the years between 1915 and 1923, Turkey perpetrated genocide against the Armenian people resulting in 1.5 million innocent Armenian civilians being murdered.

In the year 2000, Turkey continues to maintain an illegal blockade of its border with Armenia, which has prevented the delivery of vitally needed supplies to Armenia. Even Turkish business people would like to see the opening of corridors of trade and transport with Armenia. Turkey has also backed Azerbaijan in the conflict over Nagorno Karabagh. Given this pattern of hostility, the people of Armenia have every reason to fear the acquisition of these helicopters by Turkey.

Mr. Speaker, the Government of Turkey knows how the game is played here in Washington. They have recently signed a \$1.8 million year contract for the lobbying services of several former Members of this Congress to push for the helicopter deal.

I urge the administration to resist this type of pressure, and I call on my colleagues in Congress to join me in using our position as elected officials to prevent this helicopter deal. Providing these helicopters to Turkey does nothing to promote American interests or values, does nothing to promote stability, and does nothing to advance the cause of human rights.

2215

MICROBICIDES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYES). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, today I am joined by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) in introducing the Microbicides Development Act of 2000, legislation to promote the development of a new technology for preventing sexually transmitted diseases, including HIV.

Across this country and around the world, AIDS is rapidly becoming a women's epidemic. In the United States, women constitute the fastest growing group of those newly infected with HIV. Worldwide almost half of the 14,000 adults infected daily with HIV in 1998 were women, of whom nine out of 10 live in developing countries. In Africa, teenage girls have infection rates five to six times that of teenage boys, both because they are more biologically vulnerable to infection and because older men often take advantage of young women's social and economic powerlessness.

Equally alarming, the United States has the highest incidence of sexually transmitted diseases, STDs, in the industrialized world. 15.4 million Americans acquired a new STD in 1999 alone. Sexually transmitted diseases, including HIV/AIDS, represent a women's health emergency. Biologically and socially, women are more vulnerable to STDs than men. Many STDs, again I say that is sexually transmitted diseases, are transmitted more easily from a man to a woman and are more likely to remain undetected in women, resulting in delayed diagnosis and treatment and more severe complications. Not only are women at greater risk of acquiring STDs than men; but in most cases the consequences of contracting STDs, including infertility, ectopic pregnancy, cancer, and infant mortality, are more serious and permanent for women.

Yet 20 years into the AIDS crisis, and at a time when the incidence of STDs is reaching epidemic proportions, the

only public health advice to women about preventing HIV and other STDs is to be monogamous or to use condoms. Experience has shown, however, that for many women, neither message is realistic or effective. A woman cannot protect herself by being faithful if her sexual partner is not, nor can every woman always insist on condom use. In Africa, for example, where women account for 55 percent of the continent's HIV infections, women typically have little say over condom use and too often the consequences in terms of lost trust, abandonment, or abuse are perceived as more threatening than the risk of contracting a disease. Women clearly need an alternative.

This legislation has the potential to save billions in health care costs. The total cost to the U.S. economy of STDs, excluding HIV infection, was approximately \$10 billion in 1999 alone. When the cost of sexually transmitted HIV infection is included, that total rises to \$17 billion.

Federal funding is key. Currently, less than 1 percent of the budget for HIV/AIDS-related research at the National Institutes of Health is being spent on microbicide research, and best estimates show that less than half this amount is dedicated directly to product development. Clearly, this is not nearly enough to keep pace with the growing STD and HIV epidemics. For 2001, our legislation will ensure that Federal investment in this critical research be doubled from the current level of less than \$25 million.

There is an urgent need for HIV and STD prevention methods within women's personal control. Since the early 1990s, topical microbicides have attracted scientific attention as a possible new technology for preventing STDs, including HIV.

Not only do microbicides make good sense from a public health perspective but recent studies demonstrate that women want and need prevention alternatives. A recent survey by the Alan Guttmacher Institute estimated that 21 million American women are interested in a microbicide product. Microbicide acceptability studies in 13 countries worldwide, six in Africa, two in Latin America, three in Asia plus France and Poland, have documented high interest and willingness to use microbicides.

Five of the top 10 most frequently reported infectious diseases, that is 87 percent of all cases, are sexually transmitted. Over one in three adults age 15 to 65 are now living with an incurable viral STD. Dr. Anthony Fauci, director of the National Institute of AIDS and Infectious Diseases, has stated that he considers microbicide research a priority in the fight against AIDS and STDs.

Dr. Peter Piot, Executive Director of UNAIDS, the United Nations agency that coordinates a global response to the HIV epidemic, has said,

There is an urgent need for more methods to prevent HIV infection, especially those

that put women in control. The search for an effective and safe vaginal microbicide has been progressing too slowly—we need more researchers from the public and private sectors acting with appropriate urgency to develop a microbicide.

A number of obstacles currently impede the development and introduction of microbicides. For major pharmaceutical companies, there is skepticism about whether such products would be profitable after the costs of research and marketing are met because such products would have to be inexpensive. Concern has also been raised over liability, since microbicides would promise to offer some protection against life-threatening illness, even though levels of product efficacy would be stipulated in labeling.

Absent leadership by major pharmaceutical companies, small biopharmaceutical firms, academic and nonprofit institutes have taken the lead on microbicide research and development. However, many small companies and nonprofit entities lack the resources to take a potential product through the rigorous clinical trials required to evaluate products for FDA approval.

Researchers estimate that it costs up to \$50 million to complete research on an existing compound (and at least twice that to start from scratch with a new compound)—far more than many of these small companies and nonprofit entities have the capacity to invest.

Public funds are necessary to fill in the gaps in the research and development process and to create incentives for greater investment by private industry. Without federal leadership and funding, a microbicide is not likely to be available anytime soon.

Despite scientific promise and public health need, investment in microbicide research has been woefully inadequate. Through the work of the National Institutes of Health, non-profit research institutions, and small private companies, a number of microbicide products are poised for successful development. Some 24 products are currently in or ready for clinical (human) trials and 36 promising compounds exist that could be investigated further. But this "pipeline" will only be unblocked if the federal government helps support the necessary safety and efficacy testing necessary to move the best candidates to the marketplace.

Public health officials and members of Congress need to take notice. Given the growing number of promising microbicides in development, we have everything we need to bring a microbicide to market within five years—except the money. That's why Representative NANCY PELOSI and I are introducing legislation today that increases the federal investment in this potentially life-saving technology. Specifically, our bill, the "STD Microbicide Development Act of 2000," does the following:

Instructs the Director of the National Institutes of Health to establish a program to support research to develop microbicides, including expanding and intensifying basic research on the initial mechanisms of STD infection, identifying appropriate models for evaluating safety and efficacy of microbicidal products, enhancing clinical trials, and expanding behavioral research on use, acceptability and compliance with microbicides.

Instructs the NIH Director, in consultation with all relevant NIH institutes and federal agencies, to develop a 5-year implementation plan regarding the microbicides research program.