

local public health departments implement emergency response plans, educate health care personnel, and equip the first responders in our emergency rooms and police and fire departments. The bill will do much to make sure our food supply is protected from attempts at contamination by increasing inspection and tightening port security; it also ensures that we have the tools to investigate any suspected contamination of the food supply by the increasing record keeping and requiring registration by the food industry.

While I support the legislation we are considering today, I look forward to future work on bioterrorism legislation that will expand on this bill. We must require country of origin labeling at the retail level so that consumers can know the source of retail food offerings and consider that knowledge when selecting their purchases. We should ensure that we enact common sense requirements to protect our food supply that are responsible, not overly burdensome. We must expand on provisions in this bill to facilitate the development, production, and distribution of vaccinations that could protect our population against either an intentional bioterrorist attack or the devastating spread of an infectious disease. I believe we should create a national vaccine authority, as recommended by the National Academy of Sciences, to coordinate and aid in these efforts. Finally, we must continue to listen to those who will be on the front lines of any bioterrorist attack, including the doctors and nurses in emergency rooms, hospitals, and health centers and the members of fire and other emergency rescue teams, and help their local communities to meet their needs, restricting federal programs to coordination of these crucial local resources.

Again, I support this legislation and thank my colleagues for their work in crafting it.

**STOP CANNED HUNTING, THE  
RESPONSIBLE THING TO DO**

**HON. SAM FARR**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, December 12, 2001*

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, Today I am introducing the "Captive Exotic Animal Protection Act of 2001." It is a bill to combat the unfair and inhumane practice of "canned hunting."

At more than 1,000 commercial "canned hunt" operations across the country, trophy hunters pay a fee to shoot captive exotic animals—from African lions to giraffes to blackbuck antelope—in fenced enclosures in which the animals have no reasonable chance of escape. Most of the hunts are guaranteed—in that the ranch owner assures the "client" that he will secure an exotic trophy. It's a "no kill, no pay" arrangement. The animals on hunting ranches—procured from exotic animal dealers—have often lived a life being fed by hand and have little or no fear of humans; that fact, coupled with their confinement in a fenced area, all but assure a successful "hunt."

This bill will complement the efforts undertaken by states to restrict this practice. California and other states already outlaw this practice. In November 2000, voters in Montana approved a ballot initiative to ban the

practice of shooting animals in fenced enclosures. The individuals who spearheaded this campaign were, it is important to note, lifelong hunters. They were members of groups such as the Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation, the Montana Wildlife Federation, and the Montana Bowhunters' Association—all of which avidly support hunting, but oppose canned hunts. This is a strong indicator that "canned hunts" are out of step with common principles governing responsible hunting.

The regulation of the transport and treatment of exotic mammals on shooting preserves, however, falls outside the traditional domains of state agriculture departments and state fish and game agencies. In short, these animals often fall into regulatory limbo at the state level. In order to address this problem, which directly involves an issue of interstate commerce, since exotic mammals are those which typically are sold across state lines or imported because they are not native to the United States, I am introducing the "Captive Exotic Animal Protection Act."

This bill will halt the interstate shipment of exotic mammals for the purpose of being shot in a fenced enclosure for entertainment or a trophy. It is sensible legislation that is backed by responsible hunters, animal protection advocates, wildlife scientists, environmentalists, and zoological professionals. The Senate has the same bill before it for consideration.

This bill will not limit the licensed hunting of any native mammals or any native or exotic birds. The state fish and game agencies regulate and license the hunting of native species. A federal remedy is needed, however, to deal with the purely commercial interstate movement of exotics destined to be killed at "canned hunting" ranches.

This bill supports responsible hunting, while curbing something so out-of-bounds with hunting norms that hunters and animal advocates alike view it as unfair and inhumane.

**TRIBUTE TO SHOALS  
ELEMENTARY**

**HON. SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO**

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, December 12, 2001*

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Shoals Elementary in recognition of their achievement as an "exemplary" school.

Shoals Elementary has been selected as one of the top 50 schools of West Virginia. "Exemplary" status is based on Stanford Achievement Test results, attendance, drop out rates, and writing exam scores.

I commend the leadership and faculty on their dedication to the children that walk through their doors each day. They have set an incredible example for the other 817 schools in West Virginia.

I equally commend the students and parents of Shoals Elementary for their commitment to a quality education and a bright future.

Efforts to bring superior education to all of West Virginia and America are among our top priorities. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring Shoals Elementary.

ANALYSIS OF SECTION II OF H.R.  
2887

**HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, December 12, 2001*

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on October 11, 2001, the Committee on Energy and Commerce favorably reported H.R. 2887, the "Best Pharmaceuticals for Children Act." I commend the Committee for its great work to reauthorize legislation to promote labeling of prescription drugs for use in children. However, I am concerned that a section of this legislation may violate the Takings Clause of the United States Constitution. As a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I have vigorously sought to protect private property rights and to pursue just compensation for those whose property rights are violated. My analysis of section 11 of H.R. 2887, brings me to the conclusion that it would violate current exclusive rights of manufacturers and in turn expose the U.S. government to substantial claims for just compensation. Attached are legal memoranda by Professor Laurence Tribe of Harvard University that validate my concerns:

MEMORANDUM TO THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS—CONSTITUTIONAL ANALYSIS OF H.R. 2887'S PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO HATCH-WAXMAN ACT ELIMINATING THREE-YEAR CLINICAL STUDIES EXCLUSIVITY PERIOD

(By Laurence H. Tribe)

I have been asked to address the implications under the Fifth Amendment Just Compensation Clause (sometimes called the Takings Clause) of H.R. 2887, which proposes to eliminate the three-year clinical studies exclusivity period under the Hatch-Waxman Act. Section 11(a) of the reported version of H.R. 2887 provides that a generic drug may be approved under the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act ("FDCA") even when its labeling omits a pediatric use that is protected by patent or marketing exclusivity under Section 505(j)(5)(D)(iii) and (iv). Section 11(b) of H.R. 2887 implies that Section 11(a) applies to already running three-year exclusivity periods.

The FDCA establishes a quid pro quo that H.R. 2887 would retroactively abrogate. In order to gain regulatory approval from the FDA, a pharmaceutical company must invest enormous time, money, and human resources to develop extensive clinical data regarding its drug. At the end of a three-year period, the protected data is opened to the public and may be used by competitors. In exchange, Section 505(j)(5)(D)(iii) and (iv) provide that the FDA "may not make the approval of [a competitor application]... for three years." H.R. 2887 now proposes to undo the bargain struck by current law.

Under the Supreme Court's decision in *Ruckelshaus v. Monsanto Co.*, 467 U.S. 986 (1984), and related precedent, the retroactive elimination of the exclusivity period qualifies as a taking of private property for public use and therefore triggers the right to just compensation.

**ANALYSIS**

**1. The Ruckelshaus Decision.**

Fifth Amendment analysis must begin with the text of the Clause: "nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation." The meaning of that text as most authoritatively set forth in the Supreme Court's decision in *Ruckelshaus v. Monsanto Co.*, 467 U.S. 986 (1984), which held

that the government's use of private proprietary research data for public regulatory purposes constituted a compensable taking. Ruckelshaus is highly instructive because the statutory change at issue in that case was the elimination of an exclusive pesticide marketing scheme, closely analogous to the change effected by H.R. 2887. The fact that Ruckelshaus concerned pesticides, while the instant controversy involves pharmaceuticals, obviously is not material to the constitutional analysis.

The Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act ("FIFRA") at issue in Ruckelshaus originally limited an agency's use of studies submitted by an initial applicant to support later applicants' efforts to obtain approval of similar formulations. In 1978, FIFRA was amended to weaken that restriction. The 1978 amendments were then challenged in court, and the Supreme Court held in Ruckelshaus that they worked a taking and triggered the right to just compensation.

The Supreme Court noted that, with respect to trade secrets submitted by Monsanto under FIFRA between 1972 and 1978, "the Federal Government had explicitly guaranteed to Monsanto and other registration applicants an extensive measure of confidentiality and exclusive use. This explicit governmental guarantee formed the basis of a reasonable investment-backed expectation." 467 U.S. at 1011 (emphasis added). The Court then explained that "[i]f EPA, consistent with the authority granted it by the 1978 FIFRA amendments, were now . . . to consider those data in evaluating the application of a subsequent applicant in a manner not authorized by the version of FIFRA in effect between 1972 and 1978, EPA's actions would frustrate Monsanto's reasonable investment-backed expectation with respect to its control over the use and dissemination of the data it had submitted." Id.

Plainly, the Supreme Court's decision in Ruckelshaus provides strong support for the conclusion that the elimination of the three-year clinical studies exclusivity period would effect a compensable taking.

2. There is a Protectable Property Right. I understand that proponents of H.R. 2887 take the position that the elimination of the three-year clinical studies exclusivity period does not work a taking because it does not implicate any property rights at all. I find this surprising, to say the least, because the Government did not even dispute in the Ruckelshaus case that "Monsanto has certain property rights in its information, research and test data that it has submitted under FIFRA to EPA and its predecessor agencies which may be protected by the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution." 467 U.S. at 1001.

Indeed, in *Tri-Bio Laboratories, Inc. v. United States*, 836 F.2d 135 (3d Cir. 1987), the court upheld the refusal of the FDA to allow a generic animal drug manufacturer to incorporate in its application the research and testing data submitted by another manufacturer which had earlier obtained approval to market the predecessor brand name drug. The FDA insisted that such testing data was proprietary and confidential and that its use "to review generic drug applications would constitute expropriation." Id. At 138. The court agreed that the FDA's rules "provided pioneer animal drug manufacturers with [a] reasonable investment-backed expectation that the FDA would refrain from nonconsensual use of research material." Id. at 140-41. "Use of that material in processing the [competitor's] application, therefore, would constitute a Fifth Amendment taking, requiring payment of compensation by the government." Id. at 141.

The Supreme Court has long held that intangible property rights are protected under

the Fifth Amendment's Just Compensation Clause. See, e.g., *Armstrong v. United States*, 364 U.S. 40, 44 (1960) (materialman's lien protected); *Louisville Joint Stock Land Bank v. Radford*, 295 U.S. 555, 596-602 (1935) (real estate lien protected); *Lynch v. United States*, 292 U.S. 571, 579 (1934) (contracts protected). See also Laurence H. Tribe, *AMERICAN CONSTITUTIONAL LAW* §9-2, p. 591 n.11 (2d ed. 1988) (observing that the Supreme Court has tended toward "a broadened conception of 'property' in takings analysis," "incorporating wholly intangible forms of property").

By the same token, the Court has also opened that the retroactive alteration of the terms on which a patent is granted would work a compensable taking of private property. See, e.g., *Richmond Screw Anchor Co. v. United States*, 275 U.S.C. 331, 345 (1928) (elimination of patent infringement action "is an attempt to take away from a private citizen his lawful claim for damage to his property by another private person, which but for this act he would have against the private wrongdoer. This result . . . would seem to raise a serious question . . . under the fifth Amendment to the Federal Constitution."); *William Cramp & Sons Ship & Engine Bldg Co. v. International Curtis Marine Turbine Co.*, 246 U.S. 28, 39-40 (1918) ("rights secured under the grant of letters patent by the United States [a]re property and protected by the guarantees of the Constitution and not subject therefore to be appropriated even for public use without adequate compensation").

Under these principles, the exclusivity guaranteed by Section 505(j)(5)(D) (iii) and (iv), which is mirrored in FDA regulations, see 21 CFR §314.127(a)(7), is a prototypical property right. As the Supreme Court has explained, the right to exclude "is central to the very definition of the property interest." Ruckelshaus, 467 U.S. at 1011, for it is "one of the most essential sticks in the bundle of rights that are commonly characterized as property." *Kaiser Aetna v. United States*, 444 U.S. 164, 176 (1979); see also *Nollan v. California Coastal Comm'n*, 483 U.S. 825, 830-32 (1987) (same); *Loretto v. Teleprompter Manhattan CATV Corp.*, 458 U.S. 419, 435 (1982) ("The power to exclude has traditionally been considered one of the most treasured strands in an owner's bundle of property rights."). See generally Thomas W. Merrill & Henry E. Smith, *What Happened to Property in Law & Economics?*, 111 Yale L.J. 357, 360 (Nov. 2001) ("property rights attach to persons insofar as they have a particular relationship to some thing and confer on those persons the right to exclude a large and indefinite class of other persons ('the world') from the thing").

As the Court explained in Ruckelshaus, "[W]ith respect to a trade secret, the right to exclude others is central to the very definition of the property interest. Once . . . others are allowed to use those data, the holder of the trade secret has lost his proprietary interest in the data." 467 U.S. at 1011. "[T]he value of a trade secret lies in the competitive advantage it gives its owner over competitors. Thus, it is the fact that operation of the [statutory change] will allow a competitor to register more easily its product or to use the disclosed data to improve its own technology that may constitute a taking." Id. at 1011 n.15.

The three-year exclusivity period is enforceable by means of a suit against the FDA under 21 C.F.R. §§10.30, 10.35. It is also transferable. See 59 Fed. Reg. 50338, 50339 (Oct. 3, 1994) ("an applicant may purchase an application or rights of data and information in an application (i.e., exclusive rights to a new clinical investigation), from which exclusively would flow").

Thus, the three-year exclusivity period—acquired at great expense and heretofore protected by law—is the very essence of an "investment-backed expectation" that is fully protected by the Fifth Amendment from any taking without just compensation. *Penn Central Transp. Co. v. City of New York*, 438 U.S. 104, 124 (1978).

Moreover, the confidential and proprietary research submitted by drug manufacturers—which under H.R. 2887 would be used by the FDA in order to approve generic versions of the same pharmaceuticals—also qualifies as a "trade secret" under applicable state law. "A trade secret is any information that can be used in the operation of a business or other enterprise and that is sufficiently valuable and secret to afford an actual or potential economic advantage over others." Restatement (Third) of Unfair Competition §39 (1995). The Uniform Trade Secrets Act, §1(4), promulgated in 1979 by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, contains the equivalent definition of "trade secret." Tellingly, confidential information regarding the production of pharmaceuticals is the very first illustrative example of a trade secret provided by the Restatement. See Restatement (Third) of Unfair Competition at §39, Illustration 1. See also MILGRIM ON TRADE SECRETS §1.09 (2001) (providing numerous examples where pharmaceutical information has been classified as a trade secret).

#### CONCLUSION

The retroactive elimination of the three-year clinical studies exclusivity period would undoubtedly effect a "taking" of "private property" within the meaning of the Fifth Amendment. Any public purposes that may be advanced in favor of H.R. 2887 bear only on whether the taking is altogether void—which it is if the property is not put to a "public use," equated by the Supreme Court with "public purpose." See *Hawaii Housing Auth. v. Midkiff*, 465 U.S. 229, 239-41 (1984). If property is taken for a "private use"—i.e., a purely private purpose—then the taking violates substantive due process and cannot be saved by an amount of compensation. See, e.g., *Thompson v. Consolidated Gas Utilities Corp.*, 300 U.S. 55, 77-79 (1937).

A "purpose purpose," however compelling, has no bearing whatsoever on whether just compensation is required in order to make the taking valid. Compensation for a taking of private property is invariably required precisely when that taking is for a public purpose or use. See, e.g., *Jed Rubinfeld, Usings*, 102 Yale L.J. 1077 (1993). The Just Compensation Clause is concerned not with the question whether a given taking was substantially justifiable but solely with the question of who should pay for presumptively justifiable takings. As the Supreme Court has often put it, one of the principal purposes of the Just Compensation Clause is "to bar Government from forcing some people alone to bear public burdens which, in all fairness and justice, should be borne by the public as a whole." *Dolan v. City of Tigard*, 512 U.S. 374, 384 (1994) (quoting *Armstrong v. United States*, 364 U.S. 40, 49 (1960)).

From the fact that just compensation would be required, and the further fact that the Just Compensation Clause is self-executing, see *First English Evangelical Lutheran Church of Glendale v. County of Los Angeles*, 482 U.S. 304, 315, 316 n.9 (1987), it follows that H.R. 2887 would represent an enormous tax lien automatically levied by the measure's proponents upon the rest of the nation. It would, despite protestations of its proponents that no tax expenditure would be required and thus that no added appropriation or tax levy would be needed, have to be

funded either by new or higher taxes or by an equivalent cut in spending on military or other discretionary budget items. H.R. 2887, therefore, cannot be evaluated as though it would provide some sort of pharmaceutical free lunch. Someone's ox, to mix metaphors just a bit, would plainly have to be gored to pay for whatever public benefits the measure might provide. That the cost could quietly and painlessly be laid at the feet of private investors in pharmaceutical companies is a pure mirage. Those investors know their rights, and they know the address of the U.S. Court of Federal Claims.

#### DIETARY SUPPLEMENT TAX FAIRNESS ACT

**HON. DAN BURTON**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, December 12, 2001*

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be reintroducing this legislation in the Congress. It represents an important and critical step forward to improving our healthcare system. Throughout my career in Congress, I have always led efforts to examine and support complementary and alternative healthcare. In chairing the House Committee on Government Reform, we have learned a great deal about healthcare that represents a marketplace of over \$30 billion dollars and is utilized by one out of every four Americans.

One critical item we have discovered is the inequities that exist within the Internal Revenue Code that discourage good health and wellness. For example, many consumers often ask why there are no insurance benefits for dietary supplements, which are used primarily to maintain good health and wellness. Some dietary supplements, like Folic Acid, can help prevent disease or disease risks like birth defects. Many insurance companies would like to offer coverage to their beneficiaries who continually demand this type of coverage. Unfortunately, the tax code does not allow an insurer to offer this coverage without incurring tax liabilities to consumers and higher administration costs. This powerful disincentive needs to be removed so health insurers can begin developing meaningful and cost effective benefits for their beneficiaries and assist them in maintaining good health longer.

I am pleased to be joined by five of my colleagues on the reintroduction of this bill. I am pleased that Mr. CANNON of Utah, Mr. ISTOOK of Oklahoma, Mr. PAUL of Texas, and Mr. HORN of California have joined as cosponsors in this bill. I am also pleased to be joined by the Gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. PALLONE in reintroducing this legislation. It emphasizes two other important things for my colleagues. This legislation is bipartisan and should be supported by members on both sides of the aisle.

I also note last week the White House Commission on Complementary and Alternative Medicine Policy convened for one of its final meetings. This Commission will be issuing an important report and recommendations for the Congress and the Administration in March 2002. One of the several key recommendations that is likely to be made by the Commission is that the Congress begin reforming the Internal Revenue Code to support and encour-

age health insurance coverage for complementary health care. The federal government should be actively working to remove barriers to coverage and access to complementary health care. I look forward to reviewing that report when it is released next year and work with the Administration to implement the recommendations.

COMMENDING MR. JAMES D.  
RUTH, CITY MANAGER OF ANA-  
HEIM, CALIFORNIA

**HON. CHRISTOPHER COX**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, December 12, 2001*

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Mr. James D. Ruth, City Manager of Anaheim, California, who is ending his 45 year career in public service at the end of this year.

After serving in several California municipalities, Jim came to Orange County in 1976 to serve the City of Anaheim as the Parks, Recreation, and Community Services Director. He later served as Deputy City Manager, Assistant City Manager, and, finally, as City Manager. Jim's outstanding services in all of these positions has earned him numerous awards, including being named "Orange County Manager of the Year" and "Anaheim Rotarian of the Decade."

With almost twelve years of dedicated service as the City Manager for Anaheim, which is the tenth largest city in California, Jim Ruth has invigorated Anaheim into an internationally renowned tourist community. Under his leadership, the City of Anaheim became a major contributor to California's booming tourism and entertainment industry.

Most recently, Jim successfully led the city's efforts to establish the Anaheim Resort District, including a multi-million dollar expansion of the Anaheim Convention Center and the creation of the new Disney "California Adventure" theme park. Jim also served as the city's chief negotiator in the construction of the Arrowhead Pond, home of the National Hockey League's Anaheim Mighty Ducks and hundreds of other special events. This concert and sports venue is now second only to Madison Square Garden in New York City in number of events. And, just across the street, Jim paved the way for the renovation of Edison Field, home of Major League Baseball's Anaheim Angels.

Jim's expertise on city issues was invaluable. He improved the quality of life and standard of conducting business in Anaheim. His contributions to numerous industry, civic, and social organizations throughout Orange County will benefit its residents for years to come.

Today, I join my fellow California colleagues to thank Jim for all of his hard work and dedication. I also wish to thank Jim's wife, Linda, who is a public servant in her own right. In behalf of the United States Congress and all of the people of Orange County whom it is my privilege to represent, congratulations to Jim Ruth on his successful term as the City Manager of Anaheim, and best wishes for a well-deserved retirement.

TRIBUTE TO MAJORITY LEADER  
DICK ARMEY

**HON. J. DENNIS HASTERT**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, December 12, 2001*

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, DICK ARMEY has been one of my closest friends in the Congress, and his contributions to the House of Representatives have been enormous.

DICK ARMEY is not a natural politician, but he is a natural leader. DICK came to the Congress with the idea that this institution could work better for the American people; that it could be more responsive to the people's wishes; that it could be more responsible with the taxpayer's money; and that it could be play a more balanced role in the lives of the American people.

He will leave at the end of his term with the knowledge that he has made this Congress a better place.

I am proud of DICK ARMEY; I am proud of his ideas; and, I am proud of his achievements.

I know that he will continue to fight for his constituents and for the American people every day that he remains in this institution.

IN MEMORIAM OF DONALD  
GLOVER

**HON. NICK LAMPSON**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, December 12, 2001*

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in great sadness to honor Donald Glover, who passed away yesterday, December 11th. Donald Glover was a remarkable man who was committed to his community, his country, and above all, his family.

Donald was concerned about Southeast Texas and the people who lived there. He was a long time civic and community leader. He followed me as the Chair of the Jefferson County Democrats and helped thousands of citizens register to vote.

Always a man who believed in equality and justice, he fought hard for working men and women, for senior citizens and for children. His impact on the community could be felt everywhere, he was a positive force in Southeast Texas.

Donald and his wife Helen were a team like Lyndon B. Johnson and Lady Bird. Their "matching AMC pacers" became a sign at any political or community event that the Glovers had arrived and it would not be "business as usual."

He was of the utmost character, and his attributes of selflessness and commitment to others are rare gifts that this nation was lucky to have. Donald Glover was a man who served his community with great pride and devotion. He often thought outside the box to make sure that everyone got a fair shake in life.

His work was part of the fiber of Southeast Texas, and with his passing a great loss will be felt in the spirit and the heart of our community. Today, as an American we lost a great activist, but as a Congressman I have lost a friend.