

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.

The challenge today in Sudan is to accept an obligation to act on the diplomatic and humanitarian front without becoming militarily engaged. The killing and displacement must be stopped, but little could be more counter-productive than a perceived U.S. military intervention against a third Muslim nation at this time.

In this year's presidential race there is a profound debate about whether a U.N. mandate is necessary before America can act militarily. Both major party candidates have properly noted that the U.S. reserves the right to act alone. While each gives different emphasis to the wisdom of receiving international sanction, each also recognizes the preferability, although not necessity, of obtaining international support. What hasn't been discussed is the question of whether the U.S. reserves the right not to engage militarily even if there is a U.N. mandate to act. The answer is clearly yes. We reserve the right not to use force, just as we reserve the right to defend ourselves.

Sudan is a case in point. The U.S. is attempting to nudge the Security Council in a more attentive way, but our emphasis is properly on pressing for African Union rather than U.S. force deployment, with the understanding that we may have to give material and logistic support to African soldiers. Such an approach was well envisioned by the founders of the U.N. Indeed, with the principal exception of the Korean war, the Big Five of the Security Council have traditionally provided the funding for peacekeeping forces, while the troops themselves have generally been drawn from smaller or non-aligned countries, such as Canada, Nigeria and India.

In this context, an operation to bring peace to Darfur should involve many countries and, as the Special Representative to the Secretary General for Sudan Jan Pronk said, be "broad, big, and quick." U.S. focus should be on:

1. Humanitarian assistance. Some aid is already en route, purchased with money diverted from Iraq. More is required. The need is dire and urgent. People of Darfur lack adequate shelter, potable water and health care facilities. They do not expect to see a usable harvest until January 2006.

2. Regional Organizations. To carry out its mission, the African Union needs a broad mandate for at least 3,500 armed and unarmed troops and authority to use force if necessary. As it is, the AU, currently has a limited mandate for a 305-person armed force serving to protect 100 or so unarmed monitors of the April 8th cease fire between the Sudan Liberation Army, the Justice and Equity Movement and government forces.

3. Negotiations. These must be pursued on two fronts. One, to settle the 21-year-old conflict between the North (the government) and the South of Sudan; the other, to bring peace to Darfur. The two situations are interrelated and neither can be credibly brought to a close without the other. An agreement between the North and the South hopefully can provide a framework for a settlement between the rebels and the Sudanese government in Darfur, but progress on the first front should not be a condition to seek progress on the second.

4. Leverage. The U.S. and the U.N. are preparing a list of sanctions to induce the Sudanese government to comply. In the bill before us, H.R. 5061, the President is empowered to freeze Sudanese assets, restrict travel and impose other sanctions. It is a mistake, however, to put the heat solely on the Sudanese

government. Pressure must also be applied on the rebels to stop ambushing humanitarian aid convoys.

A strong international approach to Darfur has the prospect of stabilizing a dire situation and serving as a reminder to all governments that sovereignty is not a shield behind which genocidalists can hide. Combating genocide is a world responsibility. With humanitarian aid, support for the AU, a double-pronged negotiating strategy and a carrot-and-stick approach, the prospect that Sudan can move toward greater peace and security for its citizens is promising. But a timely commitment of the international community is key. It has yet to be established.

This resolution is modest but important step in the right direction. I urge its passage.

#### THE UNITED STATES SHOULD IMPROVE AIRPORT PERIMETER SECURITY

**HON. GREGORY W. MEEKS**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, October 7, 2004*

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, since the tragic events of September 11, 2001, anxieties about airport security have increased. Most visible improvements and modifications—such as passenger screening—have already been done. Less visible improvements, particularly in terms of protecting airport perimeters against unauthorized entry, are lagging.

A recent Government Accountability Office (GAO) report found that airport perimeter security has not appreciably improved in the past three years, despite persistent expressions of concern by Congress. The funds provided for these purposes have not been delivered to airports where they are needed.

This report's title tells the whole story: "Aviation Security: Further Steps Needed to Strengthen the Security of Commercial Airport Perimeters and Access Controls." In it, the GAO notes that "through funding of a limited number security enhancements, TSA [the Transportation Security Agency] has helped to improve perimeter and access control security at some airports. However, at the time of our review, TSA had not yet developed a plan to prioritize expenditures to ensure that funds provided have the greatest impact in improving the security of the commercial airport system."

The safety and security of our airports and air passengers are contingent on the priorities established by the TSA and other government agencies.

Congress recognizes this, and in response to the terrorist attacks on our country, it established the Federal Airport Security Capital Fund to finance improvements at U.S. airports. This fund provides \$250,000,000 a year to be parcelled out according to a legally-mandated formula by the Secretary of Transportation, in consultation with the Under Secretary for Borders and Transportation at the Department of Homeland Security. Despite this fund's existence, much remains to be done.

In a "report card" published by the Airline Pilots Association, airport perimeter security in the United States was given an overall grade of "D." Based on the judgment of those who

have reason to know the situation best, a grade like this is shameful and unacceptable.

Several key airports have been identified as having particular needs for expeditious improvements. These include the four airports administered by the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey (Islip, JFK, LaGuardia, Newark); Chicago O'Hare; BWI; the airports in Allentown, Harrisburg, and Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; and Birmingham International Airport in Alabama.

In recent months, it has been my privilege to consult with several private-sector experts on airport perimeter security. Dr. Walter Estulin, Philip Allen, and David Brownstein of the New York-based high-technology company, L-3 Communications, have taken time to explain to me how off-the-shelf technology can be used to protect our airports from intruders and infiltrators who can undermine the integrity of our air transportation system. Scientists and engineers from L-3 Communications have examined the problems faced by airports (and, by extension, seaports and inland harbors) and have developed technology that can go a long way toward meeting the security needs of transportation infrastructure. One issue of particular concern is the proliferation of MANPADS—"Man-Portable Air Defense Systems"—or, in a nutshell, shoulder-launched anti-aircraft missiles. In a GAO report published in May 2004, we learn that "MANPADS pose a threat to commercial aircraft for several reasons. First, MANPADS are widely available. . . . The U.S. government estimates that a few thousand MANPADS are outside government controls. . . . Second, the characteristics of MANPADS—their lethality, portability, ease of use and concealment, and relatively low cost (from less than \$1,000 to \$100,000 each)—make them attractive to terrorists for acquisition and use against commercial aircraft. Third, MANPADS have been successfully used to attack and bring down aircraft." So far, luckily, none of these weapons have been used successfully within the United States. Still, in the "report card" from the Airline Pilots Association, defense against anti-aircraft missiles was given a grade of "F." This is certainly a cause for concern.

There are two actions we can take to address these matters. First, Congress should direct the Secretary of Transportation to better prioritize grants made under his authority under the Federal Airport Security Capital Fund.

Second, we should pass legislation now under consideration, introduced by Senators JAY ROCKEFELLER (D-West Virginia), JOHN MCCAIN (R-Arizona), and ERNEST HOLLINGS (D-South Carolina), called the "Aviation Security Advancement Act" (S. 2393). If passed, this bill would authorize \$100,000,000 for the Department of Homeland Security "for airport perimeter security technology, fencing, security contracts, vehicle tagging, and other perimeter security related operations, facilities, and equipment." This sum should be doubled. Surely \$200,000,000 is a small price to pay to assure the safety and security of the millions of Americans who travel by air each year.