

PROJECT BIOSHIELD ACT OF 2004

SPEECH OF

HON. JEFF FLAKE

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 14, 2004

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, today I voted against S. 15, legislation to authorize permanent, indefinite funding authority intended to aid the procurement of certain biomedical countermeasures (drugs, devices, and biological products to treat, identify, and prevent the public health consequences of terrorism).

This legislation is another example of the federal government attempting to throw money at a project that is already underway. The Departments of Health and Human Services already administer the Strategic National Stockpile, which contains drugs, diagnostic devices, vaccines, and other biological products to combat the public health consequences of a terrorist attack or other public health emergencies. The Department of Homeland Security currently provides the financing for those efforts, which include the procurement of a new smallpox vaccine and stockpiling of that vaccine and older versions of the vaccine. About \$400 million was appropriated in 2003 for stockpiling activities.

S. 15 takes the unprecedented step of writing a blank check to the Administration (both this Administration and future ones) to augment the Strategic National Stockpile. While the Congressional Budget Office estimates that S. 15 will cost the taxpayers about \$5.6 billion over the 2004–2013 period, that is only an estimate and the cost could be significantly higher.

Experts have expressed concerns with the structure of Project BioShield, saying that it may be focusing on the wrong drugs, with much of the spending going to vaccines and drugs that are already fairly close to production. Project BioShield is designed to provide incentives to pharmaceutical companies to develop new drugs and vaccines, but will it actually achieve its intended results? BioShield would allow a company to spend several million dollars of its own money on developing a new drug or vaccine, only to see the government possibly award the contract for producing it to another company. It also excludes products that might have a commercial market outside the government bioterror stockpile. Concerns have also been raised that BioShield does not deal with some important issues like protecting companies from liability if products developed under government contract have side effects. This bill does not appear to recognize the way the free market functions.

On a larger scale, public-health experts also contend that the focus on bioterrorism's threat to the public health is misguided, especially when considering the lessons of history. The number of deaths attributable to willfully produced epidemics, ever, pales by comparison with the toll taken by natural ones. In 1918–19, an influenza pandemic killed more people in just 16 months than World War I had killed in six years. Smallpox killed 10 times as many people in the first half of the 20th century, as did both world wars combined. Even today, malaria kills 2 million people each year; so does tuberculosis. By contrast, deliberate epidemics in the past 100 years, mostly

through the actions of armies at war, have been responsible for a few thousand deaths.

In short, Mr. Speaker, this legislation signifies an expenditure of extraordinary proportions that may be little more than a public relations campaign designed to reassure U.S. citizens that the government cares about bioterrorism. I worry about the program's effectiveness when it so blatantly ignores the way the market works, and I am not comfortable supporting such an expensive bill when too many questions about it have gone unanswered.

HONORING KIMBERLY S. JONES,
ESQ.

HON. CAROLYN MCCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 2004

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in recognition of Kimberly S. Jones, Esq., a well-respected attorney whose practice, the Law Firm of Kimberly S. Jones has served the Long Island community proudly. Today I applaud Kimberly and her firm for receiving the 2004 Business of the Year Award of Excellence.

As principle of this very successful law firm, Kimberly has established a strong commitment to the economic development of Long Island. A dedicated advocate for underrepresented members of the population, Kimberly, through the work of her firm, focuses on addressing the needs of women and minority business owners. She also serves as a member of the Advisory Board of the Dowling College Center for Minority Teacher Development and Training, further demonstrating her commitment to the community.

The Law Firm of Kimberly S. Jones, Esq. is actively involved in the local bar associations, as well as the Suffolk County Women's Business Enterprise Coalition, where Kimberly serves as Assistant Director of State and Federal Services. It is Kimberly's involvement in these organizations that establishes her law firm as a successful business, improving the quality of life on Long Island.

Although Kimberly is extremely busy, she still finds time to help the community in other areas. She is a member of the Urban League and is President of the Young Professionals of the Urban League of Long Island. Kimberly is an individual devoted to her community and this is evident through the work of her firm.

I congratulate Kimberly and her firm on receiving this honor and applaud her devotion to helping others. She dedicates herself to improving the lives of others and I thank her for this on behalf of the people of not only the 4th Congressional District but the people of Long Island who benefit from her hard work and dedication.

U.S.-AUSTRALIA FREE TRADE
AGREEMENT

SPEECH OF

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 14, 2004

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise in qualified support of the U.S.-Australia Free Trade agreement.

I support the trade agreement because it will open up markets for American goods and services. Our two countries already have a strong trade relationship—Australia is the ninth largest goods export market for the United States, with total trade close to \$28 billion last year. The agreement will only strengthen this relationship further.

Colorado, in particular, stands to gain from the agreement. Australia imported \$113 million of goods and services from Colorado last year and is the 12th largest foreign market for Colorado. This agreement will only increase opportunities for Colorado businesses to find new markets for their goods and services.

I support the bill because under the trade agreement, nearly all U.S. exports of manufactured goods will immediately become duty-free. Since manufactured goods currently account for 93% of total U.S. goods exports to Australia, this is significant. In fact, estimates are that the elimination of these tariffs could result in \$2 billion per year in increased exports for our U.S. manufacturers.

I am disappointed in provisions in the agreement on beef, but am encouraged that duties are gradually phased out. I am also disappointed in the agreement's provisions on wheat. I know that wheat growers are concerned about potential trade distortions and had urged negotiators to seek reform of the state trading enterprise, the Australian Wheat Board (AWB). Though the agreement doesn't reform the AWB, Australia did agree to work with the U.S. in the WTO to eliminate restrictions on the right of private entities to export agricultural products. This is a step in the right direction.

I am concerned about potential precedents that this trade agreement could create. For instance, the trade agreement requires both countries to enforce their domestic laws on labor and environment. This is acceptable in this treaty, since Australia boasts strong labor and environment laws and good enforcement mechanisms. But this approach isn't acceptable in all agreements. I am disappointed that the Administration didn't apply the U.S.-Jordan agreement model to this agreement by including labor and environment standards within the text of the treaty itself.

I am concerned about the potential precedent of the Administration meddling excessively in the internal affairs of a trading partner. With regard to this treaty, the USTR initially sought substantial changes in Australia's drug-pricing program. Though USTR was not completely successful, the agreement does give U.S. drug companies more say in what drugs are included under Australia's universal drug coverage program. While market access for U.S. goods is important, we shouldn't be in the business of bullying the world and potentially undermining a country's ability to provide prescription drugs to its citizens.

Precedent is also a concern with regard to the agreement's incorporation of the U.S. law that protects the right of drug companies to prevent importation of products on which they own patents. Although this is of no practical concern in this agreement given Australia's own laws prohibiting the export of its subsidized drugs, I hope the Administration doesn't plan to use this trade agreement to reinforce its opposition to imported drugs. I don't understand why the Administration included the patent law provision, and I hope we won't see this in future agreements.

I don't believe that the concerns I have listed outweigh the potential good of the bill, so I will vote in support of it today. It is not perfect, but I believe it represents an agreement that is essentially free and fair. Expanded trade is important to this country and the world, but it will only be beneficial to a broad range of people in our nation and in other nations if it is carefully shaped to include basic standards and protect workers' rights and the environment.

CELEBRATING THE COMPLETED
RENOVATION OF THE MONROE
EVENING NEWS BUILDING

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 2004

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and celebrate The Monroe Evening News and its approximately 150 employees, who also own the newspaper, on the successful completion of a year-long renovation of their building.

Serving the people of the Monroe County region for 179 years, this newspaper has advanced its values of integrity, community, and growth while remaining one of the few employee-owned newspapers in the country. The Evening News has been recognized for more than its longevity, winning several prestigious awards including the Annual Award for Communications Excellence in 1996.

The Monroe Evening News has been published from its current location since 1910. Demonstrating an ongoing need to best serve their readers, this renovation, costing \$3,000,000, will be the third renovation to this building. The renovation has reconfigured the entire interior of the building; creating an enhanced main entrance and expanding the customer-service area. While the interior has an updated, contemporary look, the exterior and additions will maintain the historic appearance of the long-standing building.

As The Monroe Evening News opens its newly overhauled offices, I would ask that my colleagues rise and join with me in congratulating a thriving, employee-owned daily newspaper on a successful, fruitful renovation. As The Evening News approaches one hundred years in the same building, let us wish them the best of luck for the next hundred years and beyond.

I ask for unanimous consent to include in the RECORD these remarks from celebrated political columnist Jack Germond, who started his legendary career at The Monroe Evening News:

I am privileged to join John Dingell in congratulating The Evening News, a newspaper that taught me many of the most valuable lessons of journalism when I worked there as a young reporter from 1951 through 1953. The newspaper had standards that were a model, and the publisher, JS Gray, was impervious to pressure. When you wrote a story that was accurate and fair it went into the paper no matter who complained how loudly. There were no sacred cows, not always the case everywhere. Looking back on more than 50 years in the business, I cherish the memories of my time in Monroe.

IN MEMORY OF VICTOR G. REUTHER, JANUARY 1, 1912–JUNE 3, 2004

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 2004

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, Victor G. Reuther was born January 1, 1912, in Wheeling, West Virginia, where his father, Valentine, was well known as President of the Ohio Valley Trades and Labor Assembly and as an active churchman. Victor was educated in the secondary schools of that state, and along with his brothers, by their father as well. The strong religious influence of Victor's early family life is revealed throughout his life in his continuing interest and activity in relating core ethical values to the broad field of social and economic life. Victor studied economics and sociology at the West Virginia University and at Wayne State University. Years later he was awarded the degree of Honorary Doctor of Laws by both of those universities.

In 1932 Victor joined his brothers Walter and Roy in Detroit for work in the auto industry. Between 1932 and 1935, Victor and his brother Walter, both unemployed, used their meager savings to travel and work their way around the world. They traveled by bicycle through Europe and Asia, lodging with farm families and at hostels, and visited relatives in Germany. They witnessed the beginning of the Nazi government in Germany and the growth of Stalin's despotism in Soviet Russia, where they worked at the Gorky auto factory. Those observations and firsthand experience led them to become strong, pro-democratic leaders for freedom and social justice. On return to the United States, Victor went to work on the assembly line of the Kelsey-Hayes Wheel Company in Detroit where he plunged into the struggle to organize the automobile workers in Michigan and Indiana.

In a break from organizational drives, Victor Reuther and Sophie Goodlavich were married on July 17, 1936, on the campus of the Brookwood Labor College—a rich marriage of shared labor, love, family, friends, and a common commitment to social justice of 60 years.

A member of UAW Local 174, Victor was a strike leader during UAW campaigns in Flint and Detroit. He first came to public attention through his role in the sit-down strike in the winter of 1936–1937 against General Motors in Flint where his voice from the sound truck rallied the strikers and the women who supported them. UAW success in that strike played a key role in establishing the right of workers to bargain with auto industry employers. From that time forward he was closely identified with the dynamic growth of industrial unionism, not only in the automobile industry, but throughout America's basic industries organized by the CIO.

With the onset of World War II, Victor served as Assistant Director of the UAW–CIO War Policy Division, a department created by the UAW–CIO to facilitate speedy and orderly conversion and mobilization of the nation's urgent defense production. In the spring of 1946, Victor Reuther was appointed Director of Education for the UAW. In this role he led a fundamental approach in the development and consolidation of pro-democratic forces in the UAW. In the years following World War II,

Victor assisted in the location of trade unionists and social democrats throughout Europe who had escaped Nazi persecution, bringing them to the attention of Allied occupation forces in the search for leadership in the re-establishment of civil democratic government. He also represented the CIO on the Trade Union Advisory Committee in the conduct of the European Recovery Program—the Marshall Plan.

On May 24, 1949, in an attack identical to that against his brother Walter, Victor was shot by an unknown assailant while reading the evening paper in his living room. He suffered very serious injuries including the loss of his right eye.

Victor Reuther served as European Representative of the CIO, with headquarters in Paris, France, from January 1951 through 1953. His work led to a greatly expanded program of assistance to the free European labor movement. Representing the CIO, he implemented the program of trade union aid for the democratic European unions. Awards bestowed by the governments of Germany and Sweden, noted below, reflect the multiple contributions of Victor Reuther in international leadership and accomplishments in freedom, democracy, and social justice.

With their return to the United States in 1954, the Victor Reuther family made their home in Washington, DC—the family home for the next 50 years. That home not only served the family, but it served as a most hospitable refuge for friends, the extended family, trade union colleagues, social activists and international visitors for all those years.

On his return from Europe, Victor served as Assistant to the President of the National CIO and Director of the CIO's Department for International Affairs. Following the AFL–CIO merger, he served as Administrative Assistant to the President of the International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW), and as Director, UAW Department of International Affairs. His contributions to international social development programs extended to Asia, Africa, and Latin America as well as in the United States. He worked intensively in India, South Vietnam, Israel and the Mediterranean countries for the purpose of initiating programs designed to deal with food deficits, the need for democratic leadership and skilled manpower requirements. One of these undertakings was the joint effort of the UAW with the Peace Corps under which the union participated in a mechanical training program in the African Republics of Guinea and Gambia and in Bolivia.

Victor Reuther retired from his formal responsibilities in the UAW in 1972, but he always remained a committed member of that union he loved. Throughout the following 28 years he continued to direct his heart, his mind and his voice in advocacy of democratic trade unionism, social justice, and understanding among all people. In his initial years of retirement he researched and wrote *The Brothers Reuther*, and *The Story of the UAW*, A Memoir, a history of family and of the UAW.

In the early 1980s, with the strong encouragement of his wife, Sophie, Victor returned attention to ongoing trade union issues. Joining with other activists he gave active support to the Association for Union Democracy and to Teamsters for a Democratic Union, which won major changes in unions. He maintained close fraternal contact with the Canadian Auto