

This specific drug is effective for millions of Americans with Type 2 diabetes. Type 2 diabetes affects the minority population disproportionately, many of whom cannot afford to pay the higher monopoly prices for this life-saving drug. Access to more affordable generic versions of this drug will undoubtedly serve as a life-saving option.

Mr. Speaker, there is currently a legislative fix in place in the House and Senate version of the pediatric exclusivity bill that would close this loophole and allow generic versions of this diabetes drug to compete with Bristol's Glucophage. As Members commence conferencing on this bill, it is crucial that this language remain intact.

Bristol-Meyers-Squibb is sweeping through key offices on Capitol Hill in an effort to retain its exclusive marketing monopoly on its near 80-year-old profitable drug, Glucophage, which reaps about \$1.8 billion in annual sales.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues working on the pediatric exclusivity bill to keep the current language regarding this important issue in place and not to lose this battle with the drug industry. We have lost it too many times, and given the current circumstances, let us do something for once that will help the consumers of America, who not only have to deal with the weak economy, but also a life-threatening illness such as diabetes.

Let us fight against Bristol-Myers-Squibb and close the Waxman-Hatch loophole.

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

(Mr. ROHRABACHER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. LANGEVIN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE SLIPPERY SLOPE OF HUMAN CLONING

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I come to the well of the House today to call my colleagues' attention to recent developments in biotechnology research.

As I was preparing to return to Washington, D.C. on Sunday morning, I was shocked, along with the overwhelming majority of Members of this body, to learn that a company in Massachusetts was loudly touting its recent decision to clone a human being for medical research.

Despite the overwhelming vote in this Chamber on the subject, this rogue company and perhaps others have

rushed to get ahead of our deliberations, breaking a heretofore established barrier of scientific ethics. I fear, Mr. Speaker, that this action may be the beginning of the end for medical ethics in our country.

No matter what one's position on the issue of human life or abortion or a woman's right to choose, 88 percent of the public today is opposed to the cloning of human beings. We should all be troubled by the fact that scientists are attempting to thwart the political will of the country and the consensus of the medical community in advancing this research ahead of legislation.

When faced with a similar claim of the benefits of what was known as eugenics in his time, the great moralist G.K. Chesterton remarked, "Eugenicists have discovered how to combine the hardening of the heart with the softening of the head."

There is no doubt that we have entered a new area of the debate over this issue, Mr. Speaker. Rather than speaking hypothetically about using some human beings to serve the needs of others, for-profit entities are actively defending this as science on the evening news.

This Faustian bargain is the same sort of dilemma that has faced humanity, and particularly civilized societies, for some time. We in the western tradition have consistently embraced the principle, and no matter how attractive the benefits, it is impermissible to experiment on the helpless. We must guard this important principle.

It is hard for us to grapple with the moral implications of a human life that is only seconds from conception. We cannot look at a cloned embryo in the face to confront this moral chasm. It takes a particularly keen sense of moral seriousness to grasp the implications of these recent developments.

One person who does understand this is my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON), who authored the legislation, along with my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK), who I joined today at a press conference where we stepped in to say that the will of the people of the United States, informed by conscience, ought to lead American ethics in research, and not these amoral biotechnical firms.

Tonight, Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor to urge immediate action to stop the slide towards reductionist thinking on medical technology and the research that makes it possible. Yes, we want to heal the sick and prevent crippling disease. Therapies to make life longer and better are affecting every family. Who would not want more time with their parents and fewer trips to the pediatrician?

It is truly amazing what God has allowed our scientific community to reap in this area. However, it is clear from the debate that these events have triggered across the country that Americans understand the moral implica-

tions of the experimentation that I have described here this evening. Cloning human embryos is a step too far. I urge my colleagues to move quickly to place these practices where they belong: beyond the pale of the law.

Ever since witnessing the disaster that was the eugenics movement, civilized societies have recognized that involuntary experimentation on human beings is utterly indefensible. Let us as elected leaders of the foremost civilized society in the world today reconfirm our commitment to this principle.

Today, Mr. Speaker, the House Chaplain began our proceedings with a prayer in which he mentioned the fabled tower of Babel. This was a tower rising to the skies, the pride of its time, a testament to the human technology of the day, but it eventually destroyed its builders and their very civilization.

I submit tonight that the creation of human life for research or for vanity is such a tower of Babel. It threatens to tear the fabric of our society, our law, and indeed, our very civilization, and it must be stopped.

FAST TRACK

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, many people in the Chamber know about the problems of LTV, one of the third-largest integrated steel-makers in the United States, and its announcement that it may in fact close operations in Cleveland and other places across the country.

Despite the overwhelming passage of a sense of Congress urging the President to keep U.S. antidumping laws off of the negotiating table, the World Trade Organization in Qatar, U.S. Trade Representative Bob Zoellick did just the opposite. We needed help in this country from the USTR, the steel industry needed help from the USTR, LTV needed help from the USTR, but the United States Trade Representative, President Bush's man in Qatar, has remained open to further weakening the rules on trade dumping, further jeopardizing American steel, further threatening American jobs.

Many of us have been concerned about Qatar long before these negotiations began. It is a country that does not allow free elections, it is a country that does not allow freedom of expression, it is a country where women are treated not much differently from the way women have been treated by the Taliban, and it is a country where public worship by non-Muslims is banned.

The message that that meeting of the World Trade Organization sends to people around the world, the trade ministers are meeting in a city and country where public protest is not allowed, where free speech is not allowed, public expression is not allowed, freedom of

worship is not allowed, where free election is not allowed, and that message is quite troubling.

It is troubling because all too often our own trade minister, President Bush's Bob Zoellick, has used language to suggest that those of us who do not support his free trade agenda, his agenda to weaken environmental and labor standards, and environmental and labor standards around the world, that those of us who do not support his trade agenda are simply not concerned about terrorism.

He has questioned our patriotism by pointing out that most of us that oppose fast track are indifferent to terrorism, saying we do not share American values if we do not support fast track because that is the way, he says, to combat terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, fast track, to be sure, does not embody those American values that our trade rep has indicated. In fact, his claims that the President needs fast track are also simply not true. President Bush already has the authority to negotiate trade deals on behalf of the United States. Instead of simply dealing with tariffs and quotas, modern trade agreements contemplate issues as wide-ranging as environmental law, food safety, worker safety, local banking and tax standards.

Congress must not shirk its responsibility for trade agreements when so much is at stake. Supporters of fast track tell us the U.S. is being left behind. They tell us we need fast track to increase American exports and to bring new jobs to American workers. But our history of flawed trade agreements has led to a trade deficit with the rest of the world that surged to a record \$370 billion.

The deficit last year is 40 percent higher than the deficit, the record-setting deficit, of the year before. The Department of Labor reported that NAFTA alone has been responsible, and these are the pro-NAFTA government statistics, that NAFTA alone has been responsible for the loss of 300,000 U.S. jobs.

While our trade agreements go to great lengths to protect investors and protect property rights, these agreements do not include enforceable provisions to protect workers or to protect the environment.

CEOs of America's biggest corporations tell us that globalization stimulates development and allows nations to improve labor and environmental standards. They say interaction with the developing world spreads democracy.

But as we engage with the developing countries in trade and investment, democratic developing countries are losing ground to authoritarian developing countries; in other words, democratic nations such as India are losing out to more totalitarian nations such as China. Democratic nations such as Taiwan are losing out to more authoritarian regimes such as Indonesia.

Why is that? Why are 65 percent of developing country exports coming

from authoritarian countries? It is clear corporations locate their manufacturing bases in more authoritarian regimes where the most minimal standards are often ignored. Western investors want to go to China, want to go to Indonesia, want to go to countries which are dictatorships because they have docile workforces, because they do not allow trade unions to organize, because they have authoritarian governments, because they are predictable for western business, because they do not have environmental laws, because they do not have labor standards.

They do not want to go to India, they do not want to go to Taiwan, to South Korea. They do not want to stay even in this country, many times, because we have strong environmental laws, because we have labor protections, because labor unions can organize and bargain collectively, because we have free elections.

Western corporations want to invest in countries that have poor environmental standards and below-poverty wages, that have no worker benefits, that have no opportunities to bargain collectively. Mr. Speaker, that is why fast track is a very bad idea.

MAJOR GENERAL PAUL A.
WEAVER, JR.

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I come to the House of Representatives today to take a moment to recognize one of the finest officers in our Armed Forces, Major General Paul A. Weaver, Jr., the director of the Air National Guard.

Well known and respected by many Members in this Chamber, General Weaver will soon retire after almost 35 years of selfless service to our country. Today I am honored to acknowledge some of General Weaver's distinguished accomplishments, and to commend the superb service he has provided to the Air National Guard, the Air Force, and our great Nation.

After completing his Bachelor of Science Degree in Communicative Arts in Ithaca College in New York, he entered the United States Air Force in 1967 and was commissioned through Officer Training School. After earning his pilot wings, he had flying assignments in the F-4E and O-2A, and completed overseas tours in Germany and Korea.

In 1975, he joined the New York Air National Guard, with which he served in increasing levels of responsibility. This culminated when he took command of the 305th Airlift Group at Stewart Air National Guard Base, New York, in 1985.

Following his 9 years as commander, General Weaver served as the Air National Guard's deputy director for 4 years and was appointed the director of the Air Guard in 1998.

General Weaver is a command pilot with more than 2,800 flying hours in

five different aircraft. He is a veteran of Operation Desert Shield, Desert Storm, and Just Cause. General Weaver's decorations include the Distinguished Service Medal, the Legion of Merit, Meritorious Service Medal, Aerial Achievement Medal, the Air Force Commendation Medal with two oak leaf clusters, Combat Readiness Medal with Service Star, and Southwest Asia Service Medal with two oak leaf clusters.

While serving as commander of the 105th Airlift wing, Paul Weaver was responsible for the largest conversion in the history of the Air National Guard. Under his command, the wing converted from the Air Force's smallest aircraft, the O-2 Skymaster, to its largest, the C-5 Galaxy.

During this conversion, he oversaw the largest military construction program in the history of the reserve forces as he literally rebuilt Stewart Air National Guard Base.

As the Air National Guard's director, General Weaver's accomplishments are also noteworthy. He has dedicated each year of his term to a different theme: transition, the enlisted forces, the family, employers, and thereby providing focus and enhancement to each of these four crucial areas.

□ 2215

In addition, Paul Weaver's modernization, readiness, people and infrastructure initiatives have enabled a fuller partnership role in the Air Force's expeditionary aerospace force.

The Air Guard achieved all its domestic and global taskings and requirements with a force that is also smaller in size.

Under General Weaver's leadership, the Air National Guard is even more relevant, ready and responsive and accessible than it has ever been.

I would be remiss, Mr. Speaker, if I did not also mention that the Air National Guard is also fortunate to have another Weaver contributing to its success. Besides fully supporting his chosen profession, Paul's wife Cathylee Weaver has had a major impact on the Air Guard's family enrichment programs. With dignity and grace, she has dedicated time and attention to Air National Guard families which led to her recently being voted as Volunteer of the Year for Family Programs.

Clearly, the Air National Guard will lose not only one but two exceptional people.

Let me close, Mr. Speaker, by saying that as both its deputy director and director, General Weaver has made the Air National Guard a stronger and more capable partner for the Air Force. His distinguished and faithful service has provided significant and lasting contributions to our Nation's security.

I know my colleagues will join me in paying tribute to this outstanding citizen-airman and true patriot upon his retirement from the Air National Guard. We all thank General Weaver and wish him, Cathylee and the entire