

us to talk about homosexuality and all those kinds of things. We did not talk about them because that is not what this is about. What this is about is marriage and the definition of marriage. Marriage is the most enduring institution in human history—the unique, spiritual bond between one man and one woman. Marriage is a man and woman that can create children. It is the architecture of family and the most successful arrangement ever conceived for the protection and raising of children.

A man provides something that a woman cannot provide, just as a woman provides something that a man cannot provide. Women can be great mothers, but they cannot be fathers. Men can be great fathers, but they cannot be mothers. The reason that one man and one woman are necessary to rear children is so that the children can receive the benefits that a man can give them and that a woman can give them. Boys and girls need men and women, moms and dads bringing into their homes every day the complementary and unique characteristics of their genders.

Marriage is the basic unit of society, the very DNA of civilization, and if that civilization is to endure, marriage must be protected. Societies transmit their values through marriages and the families they create. A man and a woman come together in marriage to create children and rear them and hand down their values to them. Families come together to create communities. And these communities come together to create our nation. The preservation of our values as a nation starts with one man and one woman having children.

If you destroy marriage and people do not get married, several things happen.

First of all, you destroy the responsibility that comes with creating children. If you destroy marriage, men are let off the hook. Men can have the sex without consequences, without commitment, without the responsibility of raising the children. That has happened in our society and societies in Europe and other places. On the other hand, if a man has a commitment to a woman, the mother of his child, then he realizes the responsibility of trying to raise that child. So when you ask the question, what is the harm in destroying marriage, the answer is the harm done to children. Children born out of wedlock are more likely to suffer from a variety of social ills, from dependence on drugs to dropping out of school.

The recent history of our inner cities shows what can happen when fathers don't marry the mothers of their children. We have seen fathers just having many children by many mothers, and leaving these children to mothers and grandmothers and aunts to raise. And then we see the deterioration of their lives because they are raising themselves because their mothers and aunts and grandmothers have to work in order to raise them to pay for the family. These kids, who are often essentially raising themselves, grow up without the values that would be handed down to them if they lived in a stable family of father, mother, and children.

Gang violence can be traced to the pressures that have been put upon marriage and the family. Kids need a mother and father and stable family life, and when they lack these, they look for their identity elsewhere. Gangs can become the substitute for families.

Of course there are great parents raising great children in arrangements outside of marriage. There are wonderful children being

raised by gay people. There are wonderful children being raised by single moms. But these arrangements are not the ideal. The ideal remains marriage between one man and one woman.

To those who say that whatever trouble that ideal is in is due in large part to heterosexuals, I wholeheartedly agree. The last four decades, on the whole, have not been good for marriage in America. Take no-fault divorce. Divorce is a pressure against marriage. No-fault divorce undermines marriage.

But I would submit that the rise of no-fault divorce, welfare policies that reward abandonment, the breakdown of the family, and every other challenge to marriage are not reasons to abandon that ideal, but reasons to hold up that ideal higher than ever.

For as much as we may suggest that marriage needs us, in fact we need it!

Society needs children to be raised by their biological, married parents.

This isn't radical or even conservative: it's common sense, affirmed by a vast majority of our countrymen, who support the protection of marriage because they know from their own experiences that without this enduring and beautiful institution, they themselves would be lost.

That is why the cultivation of the ideal family of mother, father, and children—an ideal established by nature, sustained by human experience, and supported by decades of social science—remains a compelling government and societal interest.

Despite the challenges of recent decades, marriage remains absolutely fundamental to our society—too fundamental to allow a few judges to impose a radical redefinition of it over the will of the American people.

But that is exactly what is happening.

So when the Massachusetts Supreme Court redefines marriage out of thin air, we get a little concerned, because we have seen it before.

And we have seen what happens when we don't stand up to activist judges. We did not stand up on the question of abortion, and there have been 45 million children killed, unborn children killed, because we did not stand up to activist judges using the courts to legislate.

Every leader of the groups that are opposing this legislation to protect marriage has announced to the world that they are going to take this to the U.S. Supreme Court. They are already doing it. There are 11 court cases right now. Nebraska has been overturned, Washington state, Massachusetts. There is a huge, huge effort in every state in this union, even though 44 states in this union have laws protecting the definition of marriage.

The opponents of this amendment to protect marriage are after those state constitutions, and when they get at those, or using the full faith and credit clause, they can go to the federal courts, and then it begins. Then the Defense of Marriage Act comes down. Then the United States Supreme Court, who has already signaled that they are going to, through *Lawrence v. Texas*, redefine marriage in this country, will amend the Constitution and redefine marriage.

We have been left no recourse. Judicial activism does not understand the word "restraint," nor does it respect the consensus opinion of the American people. The courts

have forced on us this question of the future of marriage, and this amendment is our only hope of preserving it.

We are starting the effort today. Yes, it may not pass today. I wish it would, but it may not pass today. But this is only the beginning, because this nation will protect marriage. This nation knows the consequences of destroying the definition of marriage as one man and one woman. If we lose today, we will come back. We will take it from here, and we will be back. And we will be back. And we will be back. We will never give up. We will protect marriage in this country.

THE "FAIR ACCESS TO CLINICAL TRIALS (FACT) ACT"

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 2004

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Fair Access to Clinical Trials (FACT) Act. This bill is designed to ensure that the public has complete and accurate information about the drugs and devices they use.

Recent revelations in the press and in the oversight hearings conducted by the Energy and Commerce Committee's Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee have raised serious concerns that some companies in the pharmaceutical and medical device industries have failed to properly disclosed important information from the public about the safety of certain drugs or medical devices. For example, there is now evidence that several pediatric anti-depressant trials that produced important new adverse information about the safety of certain drugs were not released to the public. The public is now demanding to know why these trials never saw the light of day. Although much attention has focused on disclosure problems involving the effects of certain anti-depressants on young people, the problem of selective disclosure and publication is not limited to a specific type of drug or scenario—the same concerns exist whether we are talking about drugs to treat depression, heart disease or arthritis, or even a medical device that would be implanted into the human body.

I am sure that some clinical trials do not become part of the medical literature for innocent reasons. But we cannot ignore the possibility that some studies were and continue to be intentionally buried by companies who are worried about the impact of a negative trial on their bottom line. Regardless of the motivation, however, the fact remains that we don't know what trials are currently being conducted, so it is impossible to determine whether the companies and researchers are actually telling us the whole truth about their drugs and devices or whether they are painting a distorted picture of their products by picking and choosing which trials they want to reveal.

This creates two huge problems.

The first is that in order for doctors to make good medical decisions and provide their patients with the best possible care, they need to have access to complete and sound scientific data.

The second is that when people enroll in clinical trials they give up a certain control of

their own personal medical decisions, willingly taking experimental drugs and subjecting themselves to potential harm in the belief that their participation in the studies will add to the advancement of medical knowledge and potentially unlock the secrets of disease. But if a researcher or a company that sponsors a trial does not publicize the results, the knowledge gained from putting those participants at risk remains forever buried in some researcher's computer. That information will not be available to doctors, or to other medical researchers, who could use it.

In order to ensure that clinicians have all the information they need in order to make sound medical decisions, uphold the ethical responsibility to patients and protect public health, I am proud to join with the gentleman from California, Mr. WAXMAN, to introduce the Fair Access to Clinical Trials (The FACT Act) a bill to create a mandatory, public, federal registry of all clinical trials.

The FACT act will require researchers to register their clinical trials in a federal registry before starting them and report the results of those trials at the conclusion. The federal database will include both federal-funded and privately-funded clinical trials so that clinicians, patients and researchers will be able to know the universe of clinical trials on a particular drug and have access to the results of those trials. Our bill also establishes strong enforcement mechanisms, including monetary penalties of up to \$10,000 per day for manufacturers who refuse to comply.

The registry established under the bill is intended to meet all of the minimum criteria for a trial registry set out by the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors, and will satisfy the American Medical Association's call for the results of all clinical trials to be publicly available to doctors and patients. Our legislation has been endorsed by the New England Journal of Medicine and the Elizabeth Glaser Pediatric AIDS Foundation.

The FACT act will ensure that patients have the tools they need to make informed decisions, maintain the integrity of the medical community, and protect the health of their patients and our families.

I look forward to working with everyone concerned about this important issue so that we end up with a system that preserves a robust system of research and ensures robust system of disclosure.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GEORGE R. NETHERCUTT, JR.

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 2004

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained due to a prior obligation and missed the following votes. Had I been present I would have voted "yea" on rollcall vote No. 487; "yea" on rollcall vote No. 488; "yea" on rollcall vote No. 489; "yea" on rollcall vote No. 490; "yea" on rollcall vote No. 491; "yea" on rollcall vote No. 492; "no" on rollcall vote No. 493; "no" on rollcall vote No. 494; "yea" on rollcall vote No. 495; "yea" on rollcall vote No. 496; "yea" on rollcall vote No. 497; "yea" on rollcall vote No. 498; "yea" on rollcall vote No. 499; "no" on rollcall vote No. 500; and "yea" on rollcall vote No. 501.

HONORING DEAN PHYLLIS
O'CALLAGHAN AND GEORGE-
TOWN UNIVERSITY'S LIBERAL
STUDIES

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 2004

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I commend the Liberal Studies Degree Program at Georgetown University, which is celebrating its 30th anniversary. For three decades, this unique and wonderful program has served the Washington DC area by offering bachelors and masters degrees in interdisciplinary liberal arts.

And I am further pleased to commend the person who has headed and guided this unique program for the past 25 years, Associate Dean Phyllis O'Callaghan, a constituent from Chevy Chase, Maryland. As the cochair of the 30th Anniversary Celebration, Chester Gillis, Chairman of the Theology Department and Core Faculty Advisor for Religious Studies in the Liberal Studies Program, stated at the ceremony, the "heart and soul of this enterprise—someone who embodies Liberal Studies at Georgetown and commands national recognition and respect" is Associate Dean Phyllis O'Callaghan. In recognition for her work with this program and for all her accomplishments, Dr. O'Callaghan was awarded the "President's Medal," which is the highest award that Georgetown University can present.

The Liberal Studies Program at Georgetown is truly unique, outstanding and very special. The program was designed to offer most courses in the evenings and on Saturdays, in order to best accommodate the schedules of those who wish to participate in academia while still pursuing professional careers. The majority of students in the Liberal Studies program are "working students," and the program reflects the intellectual curiosity, breadth of interest, and professional experience of these students whose lives and occupations most graduate programs do not address.

The students come from all walks of life. Some are recent college graduates who wish to continue their education by working for a Master's degree. Others work for the government—on the Hill or in the Executive branch. Some are foreign born and are currently working at various embassies or international organizations. This diversity enhances class discussions and enriches the entire program. The professors represent the best Georgetown has to offer. Many teach full-time, but a number also have non-academic careers, which enable them to bring fresh experiences into the classrooms.

Fourteen curricular fields provide concentrations in broad areas of special interest. Instead of focusing on academic disciplines, the courses are designed to reflect the questions and interests these adult students carry in their lives and their occupations. The courses and instructors enable the students to read and reflect on great issues that have concerned, thrilled and disturbed major thinkers and movements in the past and in the present. At the core of these courses are the values humans cherish, debate and that are replete in the liberal arts. The Liberal Studies Program graduate and undergraduate degrees are aca-

demically structured, intellectually demanding, and personally enriching carrying into the 21st century the Georgetown-Jesuit tradition of educating the whole person.

Dr. O'Callaghan received her Ph.D. in History from Saint Louis University and then was a Professor, and then Department Chair, at Saint Mary's Notre Dame, where she also was awarded the Outstanding Faculty Award. She is active in the Association of Graduate Liberal Studies Programs and a Member of its Board of Directors. Dr. O'Callaghan helped the program to receive an \$85,000 Grant from NEH; and a \$1,200,000 Grant for the James Madison Foundation. The author of several articles and editor of two books; *A Clashing of Symbols: Method and Meaning in Liberal Studies* and *Values in Conflict: An Interdisciplinary Approach*, she also served at one time as a chief legislative assistant and speechwriter in Congress.

I congratulate Dean Phyllis O'Callaghan and the Liberal Studies Program and wish them success in the years ahead.

COMPREHENSIVE PEACE IN SUDAN ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. JAMES A. LEACH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 2004

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, since February 2003, over 50,000 deaths have occurred during the conflict in Darfur. The execution of civilians, mass rapes, and the raiding and burning of villages which characterize this conflict have resulted in massive displacement to areas that cannot provide vital sustenance. Of the 1.65 million people that have been displaced, over 200,000 have fled to neighboring Chad with projections that more lives may now be jeopardized by hunger, disease and inadequate shelter than by bullets and clubs.

The President, Secretary of State and Congress, all have formally declared that the tragedy underway in Darfur is genocide. Such deeds can't be considered in the abstract or simply ignored; nor can the legal responsibilities of the U.S. be ducked. Under the Genocide Convention of 1951, to which the U.S. is a party, we have a legal as well as a moral obligation to act.

In contemplating actions, we would be wise to review our failed policies in the 1990s in East Africa. In Somalia, the initial decision to use U.S. armed forces to intervene for humanitarian purposes began as a justifiable, perhaps even noble, exercise of American power. But the chaos associated with an on-going civil war frustrated our ability to provide sustainable support, causing us to choose sides in a conflict for which we had inadequate intelligence and no clear tactical plan. The trauma of becoming engaged in a civil war not of our choosing or clear understanding led to a decision to disengage and a subsequent reluctance to re-engage in East Africa when a neighboring country, Rwanda, became gripped several years later by genocidal forces. Lack of strategic clarity embarrassed Washington in the first instance. Lack of confidence hamstrung decision-makers in the second. Consequently, the world witnessed avoidable tragedies: the massacres of hundreds of thousands of innocents.