

(Mr. COLEMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1661, a bill to communicate United States travel policies and improve marketing and other activities designed to increase travel in the United States from abroad.

S. 1731

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1731, a bill to provide for the continuing review of unauthorized Federal programs and agencies and to establish a bipartisan commission for the purposes of improving oversight and eliminating wasteful Government spending.

S. 1760

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1760, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to the Healthy Start Initiative.

S. 1833

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Florida, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1833, a bill to amend the Consumer Product Safety Act to require third-party verification of compliance of children's products with consumer product safety standards promulgated by the Consumer Product Safety Commission and for other purposes.

S. 1924

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1924, a bill to amend chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code, to create a presumption that a disability or death of a Federal employee in fire protection activities caused by any of certain diseases is the result of the performance of such employee's duty.

S. 1944

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1944, a bill to provide justice for victims of state-sponsored terrorism.

S. 1951

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1951, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to ensure that individuals eligible for medical assistance under the Medicaid program continue to have access to prescription drugs, and for other purposes.

S. 1958

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1958, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure and foster continued patient quality of care by establishing facility and patient criteria for long-term care hospitals and related improvements under the Medicare program.

S. 1964

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor

of S. 1964, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish new separate fee schedule areas for physicians' services in States with multiple fee schedule areas to improve Medicare physician geographic payment accuracy, and for other purposes.

S. 2017

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2017, a bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to provide for national energy efficiency standards for general service incandescent lamps, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2664

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2664 proposed to H.R. 2642, a bill making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2673

At the request of Mr. WEBB, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2673 proposed to H.R. 2642, a bill making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. THUNE, Mr. COLEMAN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. DOLE, Mr. VITTER, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 2021. A bill to provide \$50,000,000,000 in new transportation infrastructure funding through bonding to empower States and local governments to complete significant infrastructure projects across all modes of transportation, including roads, bridges, rail and transit systems, ports, and inland waterways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, despite the record transportation funding that Congress provided in the 2005 Transportation Reauthorization bill, SAFETEA-LU, our Nation's infrastructure is being stressed to the breaking point. Our ports and rail lines are at or near capacity. Our highways are clogged. The tragedy in Minneapolis last month showed the entire country that our bridges are in desperate need of repair.

The American Society of Civil Engineers has noted that over the next 5 years \$1.6 trillion in investment is needed from all levels of government to keep our Nation's current transportation system up to date. To put that into perspective, our Nation's infrastructure needs roughly six times as

much funding as was included in SAFETEA-LU.

The question is "Where do we find the transportation funding that our country needs to meet our transportation and our economic needs?"

Senator THUNE's and my answer is to invest in America.

Everyone agrees that our country's infrastructure needs are tremendous. Everyone agrees that our country needs to invest more in transportation. What Congress hasn't been able to agree on is where to find the money. Gas taxes just don't generate enough revenues to even begin to satisfy highway and transit needs.

In this budget climate, pots of extra Federal money are not just sitting around waiting to be used, and States surely don't have any extra money either. Most have budget deficits. All the conventional funding sources are coming up short, so Senator THUNE and I think it is time to think outside the box and outside the trust funds. The Federal Government is about the only entity in the country that does not borrow money for capital projects, but in this climate it should and it must.

Senator THUNE and I have come up with a creative approach to provide \$50 billion of additional new funding for transportation projects our country desperately needs by issuing Build America Bonds. Our country's needs are so great that we think funding should be made available that is in addition to SAFETEA-LU.

Our legislation is not a substitute for fixing the transportation trust fund. We still must address that problem, and next year we must start on a new transportation bill. Our legislation is meant to provide extra money on top of regular transportation funding.

This money could not be earmarked by Congress. This will not fund any Senator's pet project. This money will be controlled by the States, and used for the projects they think are most critical.

An annual amount of approximately \$500 million from trade fees will be placed in an Infrastructure Finance Account and invested for the life of the bonds, which will generate more than enough to repay the entire \$50 billion principal amount.

That means the only cost to the Government is the "interest portion" on the bonds, which is in the form of tax credits. With this funding mechanism, as little as \$2 billion a year could generate the \$50 billion in funding for transportation infrastructure. I call that a very smart investment in our country's infrastructure.

This investment is badly needed.

Citizens stuck in traffic choking on exhaust need relief. Truckers who need to detour miles out of their way to avoid weight-limited bridges need relief. As our economy struggles with stagnating wages, the loss of even basic health benefits for many, and a mortgage market that is spiraling downward, the American worker needs relief.

The U.S. Department of Transportation estimates that each \$1 billion of funding for transportation directly produces nearly 50,000 jobs. So under the Wyden/Thune proposal the \$50 billion of new transportation funding will provide critical economic stimulus that will create up to 2.5 million family wage jobs.

This is an economic stimulus idea that will generate more funding for the economy now. It will create jobs. It is a chance for the Federal Government to hold up its end of the bargain with our States.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today, Senator WYDEN and I are introducing an important piece of legislation that seeks to address the significant transportation infrastructure needs that exist across the country. The Build America Bonds Act would provide \$50 billion in infrastructure investment for all states across the country.

This legislation is a slightly modified version of bills that Senator WYDEN and others advocated in previous Congresses. While the Federal Government has allocated record funding levels to States under the Transportation reauthorization bill that Congress passed in 2005, the need for infrastructure improvements far exceeds available Federal and State funding sources.

For instance, the American Society of Civil Engineers has noted that over the next 5 years, \$1.6 trillion in investment is needed from all levels of government to keep our Nation's current transportation system up to date. To put this into perspective, this funding level is roughly six times larger than what is currently being spent.

Our legislation, the Build America Bonds Act, is not intended to replace the current user-fee structure the highway trust fund relies on today—it would be a supplemental funding stream that would allow States to address the backlog of important highway, bridge, rail, and waterway projects that exist in every State across the country.

The funding under our legislation would not be earmarked by Congress—it would be distributed directly to States. Further, this much needed funding would create over 2 million jobs, spur significant economic growth, save lives by making much needed improvements to transportation problems that exist from coast to coast and keep our economy moving.

Our legislation is cosponsored by Senators COLEMAN, KLOBUCHAR, DOLE, VITTER, and COLLINS. In addition, the Build America Bonds Act enjoys the broad support of a diverse group of business, labor and transportation groups, including: Associated General Contractors of America, AGC; American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, AASHTO; U.S. Chamber of Commerce; National Association of Manufacturers, NAM; National Construction Alliance—a coalition of the Laborers, Carpenters, and Operating Engineers Unions; American

Highway Users Alliance; and many others.

By Mr. NELSON of Florida (for himself and Mr. LEVIN):

S. 2024. A bill to provide for inter-regional primary elections and caucuses for the selection of delegates to political party Presidential nominating conventions; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I am proposing today and will file legislation to create a comprehensive and nationwide process for voters to select nominees every 4 years for President of the United States. This legislation will establish six Presidential primary dates—the first one in March of a Presidential election year, two in April, two in May, and one in June.

Each of these contests would feature at least one State from six different regions, six geographic regions around the country. The order of States within each region would rotate every 4 years—every Presidential election. That order would be determined at the beginning by lot in order to determine the sequence. And then the next Presidential election, the ones who had gone first in March would then go to the end of the line and they would be in June, and the list would move up.

It would give voters in the larger States a strong voice in selecting the nominees over that 4-month period while also giving the citizens in the smaller States a fair say, instead of the present system we have now where the small States are the ones that have an inordinate influence in selecting the nominees of the two great parties.

So in this legislation, by featuring States from each of the six regions, there will be racial, ethnic, economic, and regional diversity on each of the primary dates. And, of course, it has a much more rational proposal for an agenda, in that you start in March and it concludes in June of the Presidential election year, instead of this chaotic situation we have now with States trying to get ahead of each other, with them starting now as early as the early part of January and with it being frontloaded so that, in effect, we may find the Presidential nominee decided by the middle of February.

I am introducing this legislation with my colleague Senator LEVIN of Michigan. It is our experience as Senators from Florida and Michigan that we have seen firsthand how unfair and undemocratic our Presidential primary system has become. I might say this legislation tracks Senator LEVIN's brother's legislation filed in the House of Representatives, Congressman SANDY LEVIN. Our bill is going to try to approach a rational way of selecting the nominees for President of the United States instead of this chaotic system we have now.

Now, neither bill is going to fix the current controversy we have over the sequence of the contest in Iowa, Nevada, New Hampshire, and South Caro-

lina. For that, a short-term fix is certainly needed. What we have now is this chaotic situation where all the small States are trying to get ahead of each other. This certainty is needed to resolve the fix created by several States moving their 2008 primaries ahead of some of the other States. In my State, the Republican legislature of Florida—signed into law by a Republican Governor—moved the Florida primary from March to January 29. In Senator LEVIN's State, a Democratic legislature—signed into law by a Democratic Governor—moved its primary to January 15. What we may find is that other States may follow suit with a big jump.

I have proposed to the Democratic National Committee that it allow, for this particular Presidential cycle, the traditional first-in-the-Nation States to move ahead of my State on January 29; and, instead, the party leaders have decided that Florida's votes are not going to count in the 2008 Presidential primary. The DNC said Florida's earlier primary, which was signed into law by our Governor, would alter the sequence of Iowa, Nevada, New Hampshire, and South Carolina. So last month, the party officials decided to strip Florida of its 210 delegates to the national convention. That means that this country's fourth largest State will have no say in picking the Democratic Presidential nominee. Well, that is simply unacceptable.

Florida still has several weeks to find a solution for the DNC that it will accept; or, as I have suggested, legal action may be necessary. It is a case of fundamental rights versus the rules of a political party. And as to our right to vote, and to have that vote count, there can be no debate. I want to say that again. As to our right to vote, and to have that vote count, there can be no debate.

Senator LEVIN and I will work hard to ensure that the controversy over the respective positions of Florida and Michigan in the primary schedule are resolved; and, for the long term, our legislation would bring order to the next and all future Presidential primary seasons. It would ensure that no one State has a disproportionate influence on the selection of the nominees. By introducing this bill today, we want to begin a broader discussion about achieving lasting reform.

With the experience we have had in Florida, in the disputed Presidential election in 2000, and again 6 years later, with there having been an "undervote" of 18,000 votes in a congressional election in one county in Florida, Sarasota County, the sensitivity in Florida of having the right to vote and to have that ballot count, and to have that ballot count as intended, is paramount, and it is highly sensitive in the State of Florida. For a political party to punish a State for stepping out of line is the height of insensitivity in understanding that those votes are critical and that people know their sacred right of the ballot is protected. We

intend to see that the right to have their votes counted, and counted as they intend, is preserved.

In the meantime, we have to bring rationality to this process. The regional primary system set up in this legislation Senator LEVIN and I are introducing today is a suggested approach so that by the year 2012 we will have order in selecting our Presidential nominees instead of the chaos we find ourselves in now.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2024

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Fair and Representative Presidential Primaries Act of 2007”.

SEC. 2. INTERREGIONAL PRIMARY ELECTIONS AND CAUCUSES.

(a) **SELECTION OF DELEGATES TO CONVENTIONS.**—The delegates to each national convention for the nomination of candidates of a political party for the offices of President and Vice President shall be selected by primary election or by caucus, as provided by State law. Such State law shall conform to the requirements of the national political executive committee and the national nominating convention of the political party involved.

(b) **TIMING OF PRIMARY ELECTIONS AND CAUCUSES.—**

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In each region described in subsection (c), the primary elections and caucuses (as the case may be) in a subregion (comprised of a State or a group of States) shall be conducted on each of the following days of each Presidential election year: the second Tuesday in March, the first Tuesday in April, the fourth Tuesday in April, the second Tuesday in May, the fourth Tuesday in May, and the second Tuesday in June.

(2) **INITIAL ORDER OF PRIMARIES AND CAUCUSES.**—For the first Presidential election with respect to which this Act applies, the Election Assistance Commission shall determine by lot the order of subregions in each region for conduct of primary elections and caucuses by the States under paragraph (1).

(3) **ORDER OF PRIMARIES AND CAUCUSES FOR SUBSEQUENT ELECTIONS.**—The subregions determined under paragraph (2) to be first in order for the first Presidential election to which this Act applies shall be last in order with respect to the next such election, and the other subregions shall advance in the order accordingly. The order shall change with respect to subsequent elections in a like manner.

(4) **SPECIAL RULES FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, PUERTO RICO, AND TERRITORIES.**—Any primary election or caucus for the District of Columbia shall be conducted on the same day as a primary election or caucus for the State of Maryland. Any primary election or caucus for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico shall be conducted on the same day as a primary election or caucus for the State of Florida. Any primary election or caucus for any other territory, possession, or other entity entitled under the rules of a political party to delegate representation at the national convention of that party shall be conducted on the same day as a primary election or caucus for the States of Alaska and Hawaii.

(c) **ESTABLISHMENT OF REGIONS.**—The regions (designated by number) and the subregions (designated by letter) referred to in subsection (b) are as follows:

(1) Region 1: (A) Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont; (B) Massachusetts; (C) Connecticut, Rhode Island; (D) Delaware, New Jersey; (E) New York; (F) Pennsylvania.

(2) Region 2: (A) Maryland; (B) West Virginia; (C) Missouri; (D) Indiana; (E) Kentucky; (F) Tennessee.

(3) Region 3: (A) Ohio; (B) Illinois; (C) Michigan; (D) Wisconsin; (E) Iowa; (F) Minnesota.

(4) Region 4: (A) Texas; (B) Louisiana; (C) Arkansas, Oklahoma; (D) Colorado; (E) Kansas, Nebraska; (F) Arizona, New Mexico.

(5) Region 5: (A) Virginia; (B) North Carolina; (C) South Carolina; (D) Florida; (E) Georgia; (F) Mississippi, Alabama.

(6) Region 6: (A) California; (B) Washington; (C) Oregon; (D) Idaho, Nevada, Utah; (E) Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wyoming; (F) Hawaii, Alaska.

SEC. 3. ENFORCEMENT.

The Attorney General may bring a civil action in any appropriate United States district court for such declaratory or injunctive relief as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

SEC. 4. REGULATIONS.

The Election Assistance Commission shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

SEC. 5. DEFINITION.

As used in this Act, the term “State law” means the law of a State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or a territory or possession of the United States.

SEC. 6. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall apply with respect to Presidential elections taking place more than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

By Ms. LANDRIEU:

S. 2028. A bill to require the State of Louisiana to match Federal funding to fully address the Road Home Program shortfall; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to speak about an important issue that will determine the success of long-term recovery efforts in the gulf coast. As you know gulf coast was devastated in 2005 by two of the most powerful storms to ever hit the U.S. in recorded history Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. We also experienced the unprecedented disaster of having a major metropolitan city, the city of New Orleans, under up to 20 feet of water for 2 weeks when there were 28 separate levee failures which flooded 12,000 acres, or 80 percent of New Orleans following Katrina.

I strongly believe that the Congress can provide vast amounts of tax credits, grants, loans, and waivers but all these benefits will not spur recovery if we cannot get people back into their homes. That is where recovery must start and end. In Louisiana alone, for example, we had over 20,000 businesses destroyed. However, businesses cannot open their doors if their workers have nowhere to live. Louisiana also had 875 schools destroyed. Again, teachers cannot come back to school and teach our children if they do not have a roof over

their heads. So a fundamental piece of recovery in the gulf coast is to allow disaster victims to return home and rebuild.

Today, I am proud to introduce legislation which is extremely important to the recovery in the State of Louisiana. This is because, over the past few months, we have learned that the Road Home is facing a shortfall of billions of dollars due to various reasons. There is certainly more than enough blame to go around for the mistakes in the creation and management of the Road Home program, and fixing them will be a shared responsibility. But a significant initial flaw can be found in the inadequate and unfairly distributed funding which represented all the administration was willing to commit towards Louisiana recovery. At this stage, the funding shortfall threatens to stall recovery in Louisiana and leave homeowners without the vital funds they need to rebuild their homes. To address this important issue, the bill we introduce today includes an authorization of funds so that if the State of Louisiana puts up \$1 billion towards the Road Home shortfall, additional funds necessary to shore up the program would be available. I strongly believe this bill will serve as a hand up, not a hand out. The State of Louisiana shares a financial obligation to address the shortfall and this bill would hold it accountable, but with the State meeting their obligation the Federal Government also would step in to help.

In closing, let me reiterate that this bill addresses one of the most fundamental needs following a disaster: the need to return home. Whether residents live in million dollar mansions, rental housing, or public housing they all share a desire to return to their communities and, in particular, their homes. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation as now these disaster victims are counting on the Congress for action.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2028

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Louisiana Road Home Act”.

SEC. 2. ROAD HOME PROGRAM SHORTFALL.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the State of Louisiana to carry out the Road Home Program, provided that as of June 1, 2007, the State of Louisiana has provided at least \$1,000,000,000 for such Program.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. KOHL, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. McCASKILL, Mr. SCHUMER, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 2029. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to provide for transparency in the relationship between physicians and manufacturers of

drugs, devices, or medical supplies for which payment is made under Medicare, Medicaid, or SCHIP; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, a month ago I outlined an important issue affecting all Americans who take prescription drugs or use medical devices—the need for greater transparency in the money that drug and device companies hand out to doctors. Today, I am pleased to introduce the Physician Payments Sunshine Act, along with Senator KOHL, chairman of the Special Committee on Aging. This legislation will bring much needed transparency to the financial relationships that exist between the drug and device industries and doctors.

There is no question that the drug and device industries have an intricate network of financial ties with practicing physicians. These financial relationships can take many forms. They can include speaking honoraria, consulting fees, free travel to exotic locations for conferences, or funding for research. Drug and device companies spend billions and billions of dollars every year marketing their products. A good amount of this money goes directly to doctors in the form of these payments.

This practice, and the lack of transparency around it, can obscure the most important question that exists between doctor and patient: What is best for the patient?

As the editorial board of the Des Moines Register wrote recently, and I quote, “Your doctor’s hands may be in the till of a drug company. So how can you know whether the prescription he or she writes is in your best interest, or the best interest of a drug company?” That is an excellent question. Currently, the public has no way of knowing whether their doctor has taken payments from the drug and device industries, and I intend to change that—not just for Iowans but for all Americans.

Payments to a doctor can be big or small. They can be a simple dinner after work or they can add up to tens of thousands and even hundreds of thousands of dollars each year. That is right—hundreds of thousands of dollars for one doctor. It is really pretty shocking.

Companies wouldn’t be paying this money unless it had a direct effect on the prescriptions doctors write, and the medical devices they use. Patients, of course, are in the dark about whether their doctor is receiving this money.

The Physician Payments Sunshine Act sheds light on these hidden payments and obscured interests through the best disinfectant of all: sunshine. This is a short bill, and a simple one. This bill requires drug and device manufacturers to disclose to the Secretary of Health and Human Services, on a quarterly basis, anything of value given to doctors, such as payments, gifts, honoraria, or travel. Along with the money, these companies will have

to report the name of the physician, the value and the date of the payment or gift, its purpose, and what, if anything, was received in exchange. This bill then requires the Department of Health and Human Services to make the information available to the public through a searchable web site.

And this bill has some teeth, too. If a company fails to report, the Physician Payments Sunshine Act imposes a penalty ranging from \$10,000 to \$100,000 for each violation.

Many States are ahead of the curve on this and have passed, or are currently considering, similar measures. In 1993, Minnesota required the Nation’s first public disclosure of gifts and payments from wholesale drug distributors. Vermont passed a similar law in 2003, although much of the information is not publicly available. More recently, the District of Columbia, Maine, and West Virginia have followed suit in requiring disclosure, though not all make the information available to the public through a web site. The General Assembly in my home State of Iowa may soon be requiring disclosure as well.

But this kind of information shouldn’t be available only to Americans who happen to be lucky enough to live in a State already addressing this problem. On the contrary, this information should be accessible to all Americans across the country and it should be updated in a timely manner. I propose to my colleagues that now is the time to act.

I realize that some critics, including many of the drug and device companies, are going to say that creating this sort of national database is too time consuming and too expensive. I can hear the complaints already. But let me remind you again—the drug companies are already reporting their payments to doctors in Minnesota and other States. Companies already have this information available. We aren’t requiring them to go out and obtain it—we are just asking them to share it with the American people.

Perhaps even more telling is that at least one industry leader has taken the goal of increased transparency into its own hands. Although it is not making its payments to doctors publicly available, Eli Lilly has taken important steps to meet the public’s demand for increased sunshine. In response to my investigation of drug company payments for continuing medical education, Eli v Lilly voluntarily created a web site that details payments they make to organizations like patient groups and hospitals. I commend Eli Lilly for taking the lead on that issue, and I look forward to working with them on my latest effort.

This bill is careful not to burden small businesses—it applies only to companies with annual revenues over \$100 million. It is the largest companies who are driving this practice, and for whom disclosure would be least burdensome.

Further, during a meeting on a separate matter with officials from Glaxo Smith Kline in early August, my staff brought up the idea of drug companies reporting payments to physicians. I am happy to say that Dr. Moncef Slaoui, the chairman of research and development for Glaxo Smith Kline, said that he was also interested in a little sunshine. In fact, here are his exact words: “We’re happy for transparency.” I would like to commend Dr. Slaoui for his comments and I look forward to working with him and leaders at other companies on this bill.

It is not only industry leaders who are leading the way on the issue of increased transparency—some of America’s best medical schools are taking steps to prevent conflicts of interest among their physicians. In fact, the Yale University School of Medicine, the University of Pennsylvania, and the Stanford University Medical School have gone so far as to prohibit certain gifts and payments altogether.

So let me be clear. This bill does not regulate the business of the drug and device industries. I say, let the people in the industry do their business. After all, they have the training and the skill to get that job done. Just keep the American people apprised of the business you are doing and how you are doing it. Let a little bit of sunshine in to this world of financial relationships—it is, after all, the best disinfectant.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 309—COMMENDING THE APPALACHIAN STATE UNIVERSITY MOUNTAINEERS OF BOONE, NORTH CAROLINA, FOR PULLING OFF ONE OF THE GREATEST UPSETS IN COLLEGE FOOTBALL HISTORY

Mrs. DOLE (for herself and Mr. BURR) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 309

Whereas, on September 1, 2007, the Appalachian State University Mountaineers of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Football Championship Subdivision (Division 1-AA) beat the University of Michigan Wolverines, ranked 5th nationally, of the NCAA Football Bowl Subdivision (Division 1-A) by a score of 34-32 in front of 109,000 spectators at “The Big House” in Ann Arbor, Michigan;

Whereas no Division 1-AA team has ever previously beaten a nationally ranked Division 1-A team;

Whereas quarterback Armanti Edwards threw for 227 yards and 3 touchdowns while rushing for 62 yards and 1 touchdown;

Whereas the Mountaineers’ receiving core combined for 227 yards of offense with 2 touchdowns from Dexter Jackson and 1 from Hans Batichon;

Whereas the defense forced 2 critical turnovers in the 2nd half (1 fumble recovery and 1 interception) to guide the Mountaineers toward victory;

Whereas Appalachian State was trailing 32-31 when Brian Quick blocked a Michigan