The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, the President is going to be making up his mind on the issue of the supplemental and making a judgment in the next several hours. President Bush stubbornly clings to the false hope that success is just around the corner and that the mission will be accomplished. We know that. We know that for nearly three years the rule of Saddam Hussein was supposed to lessen violence and bring a new wave of democracy into the Middle East. It has not. Saddam Hussein’s capture was supposed to quell the violence. It didn’t. Free elections and the drafting of the constitution were supposed to be a breakthrough. They weren’t. The surge was supposed to bring stability, essential to political reconciliation and economic reconstruction. It has not and it will not.

Only the Iraqi people can save Iraq and it is time for them to do so. American military force cannot solve the problems of the Iraqi people. It is time for the President to put the Iraqis on notice that our military will begin to withdraw. No one in the administration can honestly tell the American people we are making progress in Iraq.

Mr. KENNEDY. I want to let our Members know about the substitute that has been included, that is before us now. It essentially clarifies the FDA’s authority to place restrictions on drugs with safety problems; applies only to drugs like Thalidomide that could not otherwise be approved. We can understand why it is important that the FDA probably would not have approved Thalidomide, for all of the dangers it has, but it has now approved it to deal with the problems of leprosy. We want to make sure it is not going to be out there and be utilized in terms of expectant mothers. So we have worked this out. I thank Senator COBURN for his help on this issue.

Mr. KENNEDY. The FDA takes into account concerns of rural communities in setting safety policies. We have given enhanced authority to the FDA in terms of safety policies. We want to make sure in the implementation of those, particularly in rural areas, they are not going to be so restrictive as to limit the opportunities to get the necessary prescription drugs. I thank Senator HARKIN and Senator MURkowski, who were enormously helpful on that and many other issues.

This also adds a Web portal for FDA so consumers will have a single point of access, via the Internet, to drug safety information. I thank Senator Gregg for that. This is very important for consumers who are concerned about the safety issues. All of those changes and alterations are very helpful and valuable in terms of the legislation itself.

I wish to speak for 3 minutes as in morning business and not under the time on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
So we could leave, have a regional religious war, and then try to decide what we are going to do about that. Religious wars are not easy things to solve. We have seen that with Kosovo with religious genocide. We got to see what happened in Kosovo. We helped out in Kosovo just as we are helping in Iraq.

So, Madam President, I hope we would actually debate the Food and Drug Administration bill, which is what we were set out to do this week. I hope people who have amendments would bring the amendments to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, as we know, the supplemental passed last Thursday. It is Tuesday today. So the comments I made were directed to the fact that the President has announced he is going to veto it. I just wanted to comment about that issue.

After the vote on that issue, we are together in wanting to get the Senate to both debate and dispose of amendments. The afternoon is moving along. We had statements yesterday from Senator Enzi and myself on this legislation. We had an opportunity in our caucus today—I imagine the Senator did as well—to go through the details of the legislation. So we have addressed many of the concerns. But there are still some concerns that are outstanding, and this is an extremely important piece of legislation. So we are asking our colleagues to come to the floor to let us know their amendments, to see if we can work those out. If not, we would like to have the debate on those measures and let the Senate exercise its will. We are ready for those amendments, and we urge our colleagues to bring them to our attention at the earliest possible time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. KLOBUCHAR). The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business before addressing the pending legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, there have been comments on the floor about the fact that just in 2 hours the President of the United States will have to sign or veto a bill which literally will affect the lives of 150,000 soldiers and their families, if not every American. It is a bill that was passed by the House and Senate, with bipartisan votes in both bodies, and sent to the President. It fully funds the troop in Iraq, giving them all the resources they need, and more, so they can execute this war and their duties in a safe manner.

But it also does something significant; it starts to change the mission in Iraq, that is in the fifth year of this war. We have lost 3,351 American lives. I respect very much the Senator from Wyoming. He tries to make a point that it is not a civil war. My understanding of a civil war is when people of the same nation are at war with one another.

That, sadly, is the reality of what is going on in Iraq today—Iraqis killing Iraqis. Tens of thousands of Americans stand in the midst of those who are being killed. Had the President of the United States come to this Congress in October of 2002 and suggested we send 150,000 soldiers into Iraq for the purpose of refereeing a civil war or a religious war that had its origins in religion, had he proposed all of those things, said to us we must stay as long as 5 years and spend $500 billion and risk thousands of American lives, with no end in sight, what were the chances we would have passed that resolution? None. That is not what the President told us.

He told us Iraq was a threat to the United States of America with weapons of mass destruction, and nuclear weapons, that somehow they had been within months with A Qada, that they are at the edge of it. None of those things turned out to be true—not one of them.

On that basis, we authorized the President to go to war, and he decided to take a preventive course of action—not preventive but a preventive course of action—and invade this country before they threatened the United States. That is what we are in today.

Within 2 hours, the President will pick up a pen and have a chance to veto this bill. Every senator or every representative, or any member of Congress, or anyone in this country, should vote to make this bill a law. If he signs this bill we have sent to him, it will mean that American soldiers can start coming home and that, equally important, the Iraqis understand it is now their country, their war, and their future, that they have to put their lives on the line and not rely on the bravery of our soldiers to keep their country intact.

If the President vetoes this bill, exactly the opposite message goes to the Iraqis: Continue business as usual. Continue waiting out the political opposition, not resolving your differences, really allowing this religious or civil war to become even worse.

The month of April was the deadliest month for American soldiers this year. We continue to see thousands of Iraqis killed each month in this country. The President, though he is limited in support for this position, continues to argue that with just a few more American soldiers in a little longer period of time, some more money, everything is going to get better. Many of us are skeptical. The American people believe—and I concur with their belief—we do need a timetable to start bringing American troops home on a responsible, reasonable basis.

I hope the President will reconsider. I hope he will sign this bill. I hope the troops will be funded and the direction of this war will change.

Madam President, this bill is for the Food and Drug Administration’s reauthorization. This is an agency which is often overlooked. Madam President, $1.17 billion a year in a Federal budget is not a huge amount of money. There are many other agencies with less responsibility and more resources. The Food and Drug Administration is responsible for really determining the safety of many things American people rely on. You are buying medicine, you are buying food, you are buying over-the-counter medicines. Many of the appliances you buy really have to be tested to be safe by the Food and Drug Administration. We count on this small agency to do a very big job and a job that gets bigger by the year.

The bill that is before us is basically the law which authorizes the Food and Drug Administration to do its business. I am glad we brought it to the floor. I salute Senator Enzi on the Republican side and Senator Kennedy on the Democratic side for their leadership.

The Food and Drug Administration is an essential guardian of the public’s health and safety in America. In recent years, their reputation has been at risk because of incidents of drug safety problems and questions about their independence. The FDA has been faulted for neglecting its drug safety responsibilities and for failing to respond to concerns raised by its own drug safety specialists.

Experts have warned that the FDA does not have adequate authority to pull dangerous drugs off the market, mandate changes in drug labels, or sanction drug companies that do not monitor drug safety.

The most glaring example of a drug safety problem is the handling of Vioxx, a painkiller that was found to increase the risk of heart attack and stroke and was used by 20 million people across America. Merck was aware—the company that made Vioxx—that product raised the risk of cardiovascular problems, and they continued to sell it anyway. The episode has raised serious questions about FDA’s ability to react quickly to signs of safety problems with drugs already on the market.

Listen to what one of FDA’s own drug safety experts said in testimony before the Senate Finance Committee. I quote:

I would argue that the FDA, as currently configured, is incapable of protecting American people from another Vioxx. We are virtually defenseless.

That is quite a statement. It troubles me.

That concern of that individual does not stand alone. A survey of FDA scientists conducted last year by the Union of Concerned Scientists found the following: 47 percent of FDA scientists said their FDA office was less effective than it was 5 years ago; nearly 40 percent said the FDA is not acting effectively to protect public health; more than 50 percent of FDA scientists said FDA officials care more about approving new drugs and devices than ensuring they are safe; and 15 percent...
said they personally have been inappropriately asked to exclude or alter information or conclusions for nonscientific reasons. That is a horrible comment on an agency with the responsibility of the Food and Drug Administration.

Our priority must be to take this reauthorization as an opportunity to change the FDA. The bill does that. It restores balance between timely approval of innovative drugs and safety and effectiveness.

Preserving both drug safety in recent years highlights the limits of FDA’s ability to monitor and respond to safety problems that arise after approval. Safety problems may not be detected prior to FDA approval because the clinical trials FDA relies upon often involve only a few thousand people.

This bill, S. 1082, responds to this problem by making postapproval monitoring of drugs a core responsibility of the FDA, strengthening and clarifying the tools it has to make its products safer, and improving, and enhancing its ability to monitor for drug safety problems through the use of Federal and private databases. It creates a system for approving drugs with a specific strategy for evaluating and mitigating their risks. This monitoring of drugs is a core responsibility of the FDA, strengthening and clarifying the tools it has to make the products it approves safer. The bill requires active monitoring for drug safety problems that arise after approval.

I agree with Chairman Kennedy and Senator Enzi that we should proceed with the broad issue of food safety within general order, and I appreciate their willingness to work with me. The amendment is not what I hoped for in creating a single food safety agency, but it is a step forward.

The most recent news, of course, is about pet food, but believe me, it hasn’t been that long ago when we talked about salmonella-contaminated peanut butter and E. coli-contaminated spinach. If it seems as if these food crises are occurring more frequently, they are. We may have the safest food supply that this country has ever had. For every parent, every family wants to have peace of mind that when they buy something at the grocery store, they can put it on the table, feed it to their family, and no one will get sick. There are questions that are being raised almost on a daily basis about whether we can have that confidence.

The issue that came up recently was on pet food. Batches of wheat gluten and rice protein concentrate contaminated with melamine were imported from China by several shipping companies. We just learned over the last few days from stories printed in the press that melamine is regularly added to animal feed in China. Why would they add a chemical called melamine to something they are going to feed to livestock? Well, it is a way to increase the value of the product. If there is more protein in the feed, they can charge a higher price. When the food product is tested to see if there is protein, you look for the presence of nitrogen. The chemical, melamine, when added, tests for higher nitrogen levels, therefore they argue higher protein levels, therefore they argue they should be paid more. So it is an economic fraud. They have argued that this is a product that doesn’t hurt people. We are not sure of that, but we do know that the animals that died as a result of contamination of pet food in some of them were found to have melamine in their system. It is a serious question as to whether it is toxic.

We know now that this pet food contamination has resulted in the deaths of more than 4,000 animals across America. This contaminated product came into America without inspection or without suspicion. The FDA did not have a memorandum of understanding with China or a certification that their standards for food safety were even close to those of the United States. The product made its way from the importer ChemNutra into various manufacturers of pet food. Menu Foods is a Canadian company. They make pet food under a dozen different labels. They learned on February 20 there was a problem. How did they know there was a problem? The cats and dogs told them. They stopped eating their food and they started getting sick.

So you own a company that has dozens of different pet food labels, and you notice that animals are getting sick. What is the responsible thing for a company to do at that time? Pull the product off the shelf and notify the FDA. So they waited 3 weeks before they sent out a notification. By the time the Food and Drug Administration learned about this, there were millions of cans of pet food and other products under different labels spread all across America with this contaminated product. Three weeks they waited. Why? Because the law does not currently require them to report on a timely basis.

I asked the FDA last week: What is the responsibility again for the FDA: waiting 3 weeks? They said: Well, we are considering. We are talking to our counsel. We will get back to you. Months have passed. Nothing has happened. Menu Foods waited 3 weeks instead of reporting on a timely basis. By then, the product was all across America.

In the case of rice protein concentrate, there is less certainty. Importer Wilbur Ellis purchased product from the Binhai company in China. It then distributed the product to a host of companies that produce pet food. These brands and labels have been recalled in a haphazard way over the past 3 weeks—again, delays in reporting. The FDA has even refused to name several companies for more than a week trying to get to the bottom of this investigation because the records process is so broken down at this agency.

One or more of the manufacturers sold some refuse pet food that it produced using contaminated product to hog farms in California and other States. These farms fed their hogs the
contaminated feed, some of which was sold to consumers and much more of it has been quarantined and is slated for destruction.

In addition, we just learned this week that 38 poultry farms in Indiana received contaminated feed. So the plot thickened and the safety issue grows. Now we wonder if what was originally pet food is now being fed to livestock, and if humans consume the food what impact it will have.

There is a second importer involved as well as from China that we have heard about but we can’t identify yet. Supposedly this second importer purchased rice protein from the Chinese firm in question in larger quantities than the firm Wilbur Ellis.

In terms of the investigation in China, the FDA said: We want to send inspectors to China to see what they are sending to us. Well, first the Chinese said: We deny you the visas for your FDA inspectors. Imagine that. Millions of dollars worth of foodstuffs coming in from China, contaminated and poisoned, killing off pets, threatening human consumption, and when we say to the Chinese that we want to take a look at their production facilities, no visas, I jokingly sent a letter to the Chinese Embassy, and they reversed their position, offering the visas. We have to make it clear to China and every other country that if they want to do business with the United States, they will do it on our terms when it comes to health and safety. We will never allow them to compromise the safety and health of American citizens in the process.

The amendment I am going to offer—and I hope it will be accepted—does several things based on what we have learned over the last 6 weeks. First, during this recall, consumers, veterinarians, and retailers, among others, expressed concern about the scope of the recall, what products were included, or what not to feed to domestic animals. The FDA was slow, uneven, and inconsistent in sharing information on the recall. While there are mechanisms in place to proactively track human food-borne illnesses and then share information, no similar system exists for companion animals.

I visited the FDA pet food recall Web site the day before the March 12 Agriculture Appropriations hearing and saw a jumble of corporate press releases. It was virtually unintelligible. I said to the FDA: Can’t you make this information clearer so consumers can have the information they need to purchase these products? They took it to heart and made the changes. That is good.

In addition, following the recall, the FDA checked the records of companies such as Banfield, the largest privately owned veterinary hospital chain in the United States. The records kept showed a statistically significant increase in the instances of renal failures of cats. A system in place to track these events might have caught something like melamine earlier. So the amendment creates an early warning and surveillance system for companion animals and directs the Secretary to work with professional organizations, veterinarians, and others to disseminate information.

While we are at it, the amendment would direct the FDA, in cases of both pet food and human food, to keep up-to-date, comprehensive, searchable recall lists on their Web site.

Second, the amendment closes the gap that FDA itself identified in an earlier draft framework posted on its Web site in December of 2006. The guidance and practices that govern the pet food industry are currently generated by the American Association of Feed Control Officers, known as AAFCO. The guidelines on best practices and ingredient lists are updated annually and implemented on a voluntary basis by manufacturers and State departments of agriculture. However, there is no requirement under the law for States to adopt these practices, and they don’t have the force of Federal guidelines.

Inspections are not coordinated State to State, and some States have different standards. While the FDA participates in the AAFCO process, it does not provide a list of ingredients and additives. AAFCO’s list is more comprehensive than the FDA’s. Our amendment would direct the FDA to work with AAFCO and other stakeholders to give these guidelines the force of law.

Third, the amendment closes a loophole that this contamination has exposed with regard to our imports of food. The source of the contamination we know of was wheat gluten and rice protein concentrate originating in China. Neither shipment was inspected by the FDA. If you have some peace of mind or belief that a Federal inspector is watching food as it comes into the United States, the odds are about nine to one you are wrong. Only about 1 or 1.5 percent of all the shipments of food products coming into the United States are actually inspected.

As imports have increased the number of inspectors have decreased. This is an indication of U.S. food imports by country. As you can see, there have been dramatic increases in these fiscal years showing that the amount of food coming into the United States is increasing. The number of inspectors who watch for this food to protect our families and consumers across America just hasn’t kept pace.

In 2003, the United States imported $45.6 billion worth of agricultural products—in 2003; today, $64 billion. Agricultural imports from China have almost doubled in that period of time, from $1.2 billion to $2.1 billion. Due to flat budgets and increasing responsibilities, the overall number of FDA inspectors looking at these shipments and at import entry has actually decreased from 2003 to the present time; imports up, inspectors down.

Are we surprised at what has happened? The FDA doesn’t have the resources or the authority to make sure what we are bringing in from overseas is safe. We need to tackle it in a larger bill.

What our amendment does is close the loophole by improving data collection and reporting. It creates a FDA database of food adulterants that would be filled by FDA inspectors as well as importers of food. The extra series of data points would better pick out foods and prioritize the more risk-based inspection job. It also creates a system in which adulterations are reported quickly so as to prevent contamination from spreading. This would have helped in this most recent case, but because of delays in reporting it led to an expansion of recalled product into dozens of different companies and got perilously close to the human food chain. The data would then be used by the Secretary to issue import alerts, blocking similar risky products.

I have also pursued a separate track on the issue of resources for FDA by sending a letter to Chairman KOHL of Wisconsin and Senator BENNETT of Utah requesting additional resources for food inspection at the Food and Drug Administration. I hope my colleagues will join me in that effort. Also, I am filing an amendment that would authorize a study on user fees for food producers. It is vital that we explore various revenue streams for the FDA in light of the shortage of resources they have for inspection.

The last two items in my amendment are a sense of the Senate and a clarification that companies are required to maintain records and make them accessible to the FDA as part of an investigation. This latter item would prevent delays that keep contaminations from being known as quickly as possible. In the case of recalled peanut butter this past winter, an FDA report showed that inspectors were denied documents when they were requested. The language would clarify that when the FDA makes the inspection, it will have access to those documents needed for purposes of safeguarding the food supply.

The sense-of-the-Senate language goes beyond this amendment and this bill, stating that it is vital to update resources, direction, and authorities of the FDA for better safeguarding of food supply. The sense-of-the-Senate directs the FDA to work with our trading partners to establish cooperative agreements.

Several weeks ago, Robert Brackett, Director of the FDA’s food arm, said: We explore various revenue streams to completely overhaul the way the agency does business.

I am thankful the sponsors of this legislation for the reauthorization of the Food and Drug Administration understand that expanding the scope of our debate on this bill to include food safety is overdue.

Mr. Brackett went on to say:
We have 60,000 to 80,000 facilities that we are responsible for in any given year. We have to get out of the 1960s paradigm.

Dr. Stephen Sundlof, Director of the Center for Veterinary Medicine of FDA, which has jurisdiction for pet food, much when he was quoted last month as saying:

In this case, we’re going to have to look at this after the dust settles and determine if there is something from a regulatory standpoint that we could have done differently to prevent this incident from occurring.

I couldn’t agree more. This is a situation where we need one food safety agency, not driven by the politics of Washington but driven by science, to make sure the food fed to our children, the food fed to our pets, or any food served in America is as safe as possible. As we import more food with fewer inspectors, the risk increases.

I might add that we have looked at the pet food contamination and others from a perspective of greed and negligence. In the instance of China, they were adulterating their product with a chemical so that it was worth more in the marketplace. That is economic fraud. In the instance of spinach and peanut butter, we are dealing with negligence—negligence that results in a deadly product being sold across America. But we can’t stop there, unfortunately. In the world we live in, with the vulnerabilities we have, food could also become a terrorist weapon. That may sound far-fetched to some, but when Governor Tommy Thompson left the Bush Cabinet, he said in parting that he found it hard to imagine why the terrorists had not attacked our food supply. He said he worried about it on a regular basis.

We have to have inspection standards in place that mitigate against greed and negligence and the possibility of someone intentionally contaminating our food supply, causing terrible suffering across America.

That is why this amendment is a step in the direction for a safer food supply. I sincerely hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will support my efforts.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be able to speak as in moving business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Madam President, I rise this afternoon to encourage President Bush to go ahead and veto the supplemental appropriations bill that Congress sent him this afternoon because of the language in that bill on Iraq that I consider to be bad for our troops and dangerous for our country.

The legislation that Congress has passed, in my opinion, represents the worst of all worlds. As I have said before, if people feel the war in Iraq is lost, or if people feel it is not lost but not worth fighting for, then what they ought to do is act to end the war. This legislation would do no such thing. It would not end the war in Iraq. It will not require the withdrawal of all American troops from Iraq. It will not cut off funding for Iraq.

On the contrary, what this legislation proposes to do is something far worse. It would handcuff our soldiers with an inflexible and arbitrary set of restrictions—restrictions that would take life-and-death decisions about how, when, and where our troops can fight away from those troops and their commanders. It would substitute the judgment of politicians in Washington for the judgment of our military commanders on the ground. That is wrong.

What is more, this legislation will impose on our soldiers in Iraq a binding deadline of October 1, 2007—5 months from today—to begin withdrawal. That withdrawal would be required to begin regardless of conditions on the ground, regardless of the recommendations of our military leaders, regardless of the opinions of our allies in the region—in short, regardless of reality—on October 1, 2007.

This is a deadline as arbitrary as it is inflexible. It is a deadline for defeat—defeat for America and a defeat for the hopes of the majority of the Iraqi people for a better, freer future.

I know we have heard from some supporters of this legislation that by ordering the withdrawal of the Iraqi forces to make political compromises, Where is the evidence of this?

According to the legislation this Congress has now sent to the President, the withdrawal must begin regardless of what the Iraqi Government does. Where, then, is the incentive for the Iraqis to reconcile? On the contrary, there is every reason to conclude this legislation will have exactly the opposite effect that its sponsors claim for it.

I listen to the latest National Intelligence Estimate on Iraq, which has been saluted by Members of this Chamber on both sides of the question of what to do now in Iraq. That latest National Intelligence Estimate predicted that a withdrawal of American troops in the months ahead would “almost certainly lead to a significant increase in the scale and scope of sectarian violence, intensify Sunni resistance, and have adverse effects on national reconciliation.”

How do the supporters of this legislation explain that National Intelligence Estimate? For that matter, how do they justify this legislation, in light of what we all heard directly from Gen. David Petraeus, the commander of our forces in Iraq, when we spoke with him and he spoke with us last week?

General Petraeus told us very clearly that this was the achieved progress since our new strategy in Iraq—the so-called surge—began. Consider the situation in Anbar Province to the West of Baghdad, which has dramatically improved. That has been documented not by representatives of the administration or people who support the current policy but on the front pages of the New York Times and USA Today in the last few days.

At a moment when Sunnis in Anbar are finally helping us in targeting al-Qaida terrorists, this legislation would require us to abandon them.

Madam President, what message are we sending to our friends and our foes with this ill-advised legislation? We have heard from some that we need to abandon Iraq because it is not part of the war on terror. But here again, listen to General Petraeus, who is on the ground, one of the most outstanding generals of our military that I have met since I have been a Senator, confirmed unanimously by the Senate a short while ago. Here is what General Petraeus warned us:

Iraq is, in fact, the central front of al-Qaida’s global campaign against us.

Let me repeat that. General Petraeus said:

Iraq is, in fact, the central front of al-Qaida’s global campaign against us.

If we withdraw, as this legislation would require us to begin to do, al-Qaida wins—the same al-Qaida that attacked America on September 11, 2001, killing 3,000 innocents, the same al-Qaida that intends to attack us again, the same al-Qaida that has made very clear to us what its plans for domination and control of large sectors of the world are.

Madam President, the violence we are seeing in Iraq today, the suicide bombings in Baghdad, the chemical weapons attacks in Anbar Province, the targeted assassinations of Iraq’s leaders—these are all primarily the work of al-Qaida. So the big question, then, for me—and I ask my colleagues to consider it—is whether we respond to al-Qaida’s terrorism by pulling out, as it hopes we do, and as this legislation would require us to do—abandoning the future of Iraq, the Middle East, and ultimately our own American security, to the very people responsible for the terrible atrocities and suicide bombings we see in Iraq today.

The alternative to pulling out is standing up and fighting. That is what we are doing now in Iraq and doing with some success in Baghdad and Anbar Province. Rather than undermining General Petraeus and handing al-Qaida a victory, Congress should take swift and positive action to confirm General Petraeus and our troops in the field the support they need to prevail.

The Iraq war is not lost. But if this supplemental became law, it would be lost and America would suffer the consequences of that defeat for generations.

President Bush, veto this bill.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.
Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, we are still looking for amendments. It is true that there are probably four important areas where negotiations are going on with the principals in a bipartisan way, and progress is being made. It does seem to us that we ought to continue that progress. We will describe in greater detail those procedures tomorrow.

We are urging our colleagues who have amendments to get in touch with us. We know this is complex legislation, but it is enormously important, and we have a lot of business in the Senate. Our leaders have indicated that they wanted us to be ready to move ahead on amendments. Senator ENZI and I are quite prepared to do so.

I understand from Senator from Michigan, Ms. STABENOW, has an amendment she is going to speak to and offer later on. We will look forward to her presence.

We want to again underline the importance that, if Members have amendments, notify us as soon as possible, so we can work on them and accept them if we can. We want to be able to conclude this legislation in a timely way in the not-too-distant future.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his comments. I’ll make a slight addition to what he said. For some, it may not look as if there is a lot of progress being made, but I assure you there is a lot of progress being made. One of the secrets to our committee operation—which used to be one of the most contentious committees in the Senate, and now we work constructively on issues such as this to get things done—is that we recognize if somebody brings an amendment to the floor and we have not heard about it before, it creates difficulty. When the amendment is filed, we don’t have a real good process for amending an amendment. Technically, we can, but it requires a lot of time and votes. In the meantime, it polarizes people. Instead, we take a look at them, talk about them, and we use the breaks and the Senator and I have gained from a lot of hearings on the issue to show where there could be inconsistencies and problems with the amendment. We get the problems ironed out so the amendment can have a logical chance for inclusion if it adds to what we are doing.

That is what is going on as we are speaking. The Kennedy staff and the Enzi staff, and those Senators with amendments are meeting together and working out difficulties. We will accept many of them. Some of them are already in the substitute bill we have. So a lot of progress has already been made on this bill. We want to get the remaining things cleared up. We would like to get it done tonight and tomorrow, if possible. I think we are getting a long way down the list now on problems that people had with it, and we are getting those cleared up in a way that I think both sides can agree on.

So that is why I say it is not quite as controversial as some people might expect or perhaps even want. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY, for all his cooperation on this and the tremendous effort of all the staff. We are coming down with amendments, particularly if they have something new that we have not heard about.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SALAZAR). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GREGG, Mr. President, I rise to speak today on this FDA bill that has been brought forward by Chairman KENNEDY and Senator ENZI. I begin by thanking them for their cooperative, collegial, and inclusive approach over the last couple of weeks to get this bill in a form that makes it much more effective, accomplishing the goals we all have.

Senator KENNEDY and Senator ENZI for a long time have been great advocates of making sure we have a strong and effective FDA. Senator KENNEDY, of course, has been involved in this for many years and has played a huge role in the success of the FDA, which is, as we know, one of the extraordinarily successful agencies in the Federal Government. It gives the American people confidence that they go into a grocery store and purchase food or when they go into a pharmacy and purchase a pharmaceutical product or have a prescription filled, that they are going to receive goods which are safe and effective and that they are not going to be at risk of harm as a result of adulteration, fraud, abuse, or misuse of those goods.

It is one of the most amazing successes of our Federal Government in the history of protecting consumers. It arose out of the early 1900 period when there were serious issues relative to food safety in this country, and has evolved into clearly one of the finest agencies, not only in our Government, but in the world. It is respected around the world, and it is the standard for protecting American citizens and citizens who use the products made by American companies.

This bill builds on that success. I congratulate the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Wyoming for doing such a strong job of building on that success. This bill continues the effort to make sure we have a prompt but safe procedure for getting drugs approved in this country, something called PDUFA, which basically allows drug companies to pay a fairly significant portion of the cost of the approval of new drugs, which has expedited dramatically the rate of approval of new drugs. Other than pharmaceuticals and biologics come to the market, which help people, which save lives, which basically makes life better. That is the good news.

In addition, there is, for devices, the MDUFGMA proposals, which deal with devices in a medical context. We deal with pharmaceuticals, setting up a fee system for the approval of medical devices. This is something, when I was chairman of this committee, I had the good fortune to be involved in developing. These two initiatives are the essence of how we maintain a vibrant drug and medical device approval process in this country. It is absolutely critical they be reauthorized, and this bill does it in an effective way.

In addition, the bill takes on a number of other issues which are timely and appropriate. The most significant, from my perspective, although there are a lot of significant ones here, is the issue of drug safety and how we make sure the drugs which do come to the market are safe. This involves not guesswork but finding out what the science is and what happens when people start using these drugs and medical devices. The concept behind that in this bill is that we should set up a regime that basically collects information from all sorts of different sources. There are literally thousands of different sources, but there are some very big ones that we develop information about the reactions people have when they take drugs. We have the tremendous database of provider groups, such as the Kaiser Permanente fund out in California. These different provider groups have a huge amount of information on what is happening when somebody takes some form of medication. But what happens is that information, although it is collected, is not effectively screened and is not effectively evaluated.

What this bill does, essentially, is create a regime that allows us to collect data first, once we have it, and then, second, when there are red flags popping up on that data that say there is a reaction here or reaction there or something occurs here that was not expected, that information becomes more visible under this regime and more available; and then, third, if it is clear there is something that is not going right here, that there is a series of aberrations nobody expected, then it sets up a process where we take that information out and we give it to selected academic groups of both academic and private world who have the ability to evaluate that information and tell us what is going on.
Historically, drugs will be brought to see how a drug might affect a child. It will be a science-based decision, and I believe it is critical we have in place a system which allows people, when they look at the site on the Internet, to know whether that Internet pharmacy is selling the product they say they are selling and whether that product they say they are selling has received FDA approval.

With the BSE program, we also developed a provision called the Pediatric Research Equity Act, which essentially takes the opposite approach from the BSE program. It creates a mandate where, in certain instances, certain medications have to be tested on children. They have to go through a process of seeing if they will work for children. The two together basically work in tandem and the idea is they will feed off of each other, and you will create an atmosphere out there where the two different approaches—one basically being that when all this goes on and when they get reviewed and when they don’t get reviewed, because if you were to have one sunset at a different time than the other or one sunset and the other not sunset, you wouldn’t get an effective review of the two together, and they both work, as I said, together.

This bill makes sure they are treated the same way in that area, and that is a major step in the right direction toward making sure children get proper pediatric medications. The other thing that is going to be an issue tomorrow, I understand, on exclusivity, which is going to be brought up by another Senator; that is, the length of the exclusivity that is necessary in order to get pharmaceutical companies to pursue proper research on children is an issue. But I happen to think what we have now has been shown to work, and why fix something that is not broken, in my opinion. So I believe we should stay with what we have for the 6-month exclusivity period.

In addition, there are a number of other issues floating around this bill. This bill, obviously being a major health care bill, attracts a lot of other concerns. One of them that I have filed as an amendment—but I don’t intend to bring it up unless we move into the issue of reimportation, which may be brought up on the floor—is the question of safety of Internet pharmacies. I think what we have now has been shown to work, and why fix something that is not broken, in my opinion. So I believe we should stay with what we have for the 6-month exclusivity period.

In addition, there are a number of other issues floating around this bill. This bill, obviously being a major health care bill, attracts a lot of other concerns. One of them that I have filed as an amendment—but I don’t intend to bring it up unless we move into the issue of reimportation, which may be brought up on the floor—is the question of safety of Internet pharmacies.
Internet-oriented purchasing process in this country. Another issue which is going to be discussed here, and which I understand from the chairman may be held over for conference or come into play in some area, is a crucial issue of follow-on biologics or similar biologics.

We know we can produce a generic pharmaceutical and do it with a fair amount of predictability. We know that if a company brings a pharmaceutical product which has run its course, it has proper patent coverage, that that generic is going to be safe and effective and be essentially the same thing as the pharmaceutical because they are chemical compounds.

In the biologics area, this is not the case because you are dealing with a much more complex process of producing the biological medication. It is a fermentation process, it involves proteins, it involves mutation of proteins, it involves a fermentation process, it involves proteins, which depends to a great extent on a huge number of factors which are very uniquely identified with the way that that vat of medication was evolved through the process.

You have to be very sure that you can actually bring to the market a medication as versus the basic pharmaceutical product which has run its course, it has proper patent coverage, that that generic is going to be safe and effective and be essentially the same thing as the pharmaceutical.

You will also need very aggressive postmarket surveillance in this area because you do not know, in many instances—you hope you know, but you do not necessarily know—how individuals will react to this type of medication, it is colored as a similar medication versus the basic medication which is trying to be replicated.

This area of biologics is a complex one. It should not be rushed into. I know there is a great desire to step forward and say: We have a huge victory for the American people, we can now have generic biologics. But if we rush into this exercise and create a process with approval which does not adequately account for the significantly, the exponentially more complex process of bringing online a biologic when compared to a chemical pharmaceutical, then we will not have done our job as policy people but will simply have given ourselves a good press release and in the end probably have given ourselves a very dangerous process relevant to protecting the American people in the area of biologics.

As we move along we hope that anyone who is more scattered at the present time to getting something, as ‘‘motherhood’’ as generics: rather, we have to make sure we put in place a process which allows those biologics, when they are produced as similar biologics, to have been properly reviewed and, in the process, potentially produce medicines which can be extremely harmful or could not accomplish the purposes.

So we move down this road of looking at biologics and how we give the opportunity to produce similar biologics to people after the patent life has run, we have to be very careful that we don’t oversimplify the exercise in the name of getting something, as ‘‘motherhood’’ as generics: rather, we have to make sure we put in place a process which allows those biologics, when they are produced as similar biologics, to have been properly reviewed and, in the process, potentially produce medicines which can be extremely harmful or could not accomplish the purposes.

This means that almost in every instance of an individual biologic, you are going to have to have clinical trials for the similar biologic. There are going to be instances where you can actually bring to the market something that doesn’t go through clinical trials in this area, in my opinion, and you have to be very sure that you demonstrate safety and effectiveness of the similar product before you step into this arena of awarding the authority to go ahead and sell that product in the market generally.
Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, the amendment referred to under subparagraph (A), and how the buyer can continue to purchase the tools, treatments, or any other required item to continually treat the turtle; and
(C) a statement that buyers of pet turtles should not abandon the turtle or abandon it outside, as the turtle may become an invasive species to the local community, but should instead return it to a commercial retail pet seller or other organization that would accept turtles no longer wanted as pets.
(b) FDA REVIEW OF STATE PROTECTIONS.—
The Food and Drug Administration may, after providing an opportunity for the affected State to respond, restrict the sale of a turtle only if the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines, that the actual implementation State health protections described in subsection (a) are insufficient to prevent consumers from being sold as pets.
(c) FDA REVIEW OF STATE PROTECTIONS.—
The Food and Drug Administration may, after providing an opportunity for the affected State to respond, restrict the sale of a turtle only if the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines, that the actual implementation State health protections described in subsection (a) are insufficient to prevent consumers from being sold as pets.
SEC. 3. SHORT TITLE.
This title may be cited as the “Domestic Pet Turtle Access Act of 2007.”
SEC. 4. FINDINGS.
Congress makes the following findings:
(1) Pet turtles less than 10.2 centimeters in diameter have been banned for sale in the United States by the Food and Drug Administration since 1975 due to health concerns.
(2) Pet turtles should not be abandoned in the United States that also can carry salmonella, and the seriousness associated with salmonella poisoning.
(3) University research has shown that these animals be treated for salmonella bacteria before being sold as pets.
(4) The technology to treat turtles for salmonella is well outside, as the turtle may become an invasive species to the local community, but should instead return it to a commercial retail pet seller or other organization that would accept turtles no longer wanted as pets.
(a) information regarding—
(i) the possibility that salmonella can recolonize in turtles;
(ii) the dangers, including possible severe illness or death, especially for at-risk people who may be susceptible to salmonella poisoning, such as children, pregnant women, and others who may have weak immune systems, that could result if the turtle is not properly handled and safely maintained;
(iii) the proper handling of the turtle, including an explanation of proper hygiene such as handwashing after handling a turtle; and
(iv) the proven methods of treatment that, if properly applied, keep the turtle safe from salmonella.
(b) A detailed explanation of how properly treat the turtle to keep it safe from salmonella, using the proven methods of treatment referred to under subparagraph (A), and how the buyer can continue to purchase the tools, treatments, or any other required item to continually treat the turtle; and
(c) a statement that buyers of pet turtles should not abandon the turtle or abandon it outside, as the turtle may become an invasive species to the local community, but should instead return it to a commercial retail pet seller or other organization that would accept turtles no longer wanted as pets.
(2) The Food and Drug Administration does not ban the sale of iguanas or other lizards, snakes, frogs, or other amphibians or reptiles that are sold as pets in the United States that also can carry salmonella, and the seriousness associated with salmonella poisoning.
(3) University research has shown that these animals be treated for salmonella bacteria before being sold as pets.
(4) The technology to treat turtles for salmonella is well advanced since 1975. Treatments exist that can nearly eradicate salmonella from turtles, and individuals are more aware of the dangers of salmonella, how to treat salmonella poisoning, and the seriousness associated with salmonella poisoning.
(5) University research has also shown that pet owners can be equipped with a treatment regimen that allows the turtle to be maintained safe from salmonella.
(6) The Food and Drug Administration should allow the sale of turtles less than 10.2 centimeters in diameter as pets as long as the sellers are required to use proven methods to treat these turtles for salmonella.
SEC. 5. SALE OF BABY TURTLES.
Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Food and Drug Administration shall not require that a turtle be treated in such a way that they can be raised, shipped, and distributed without having a recolonization of salmonella.
(1) The State or territory in which such farmer is located has developed a regulatory process by which pet turtle farmers are required to have a State license to breed, hatch, raise, ship, receive, ship, transport, export, or sell pet turtles or pet turtle eggs;
Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. We are reviewing the proposal. We will work very closely with the Senator, and we will be back in touch making a recommendation, working with her. We thank the Senator very much.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk will call the roll.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise in support of S. 1082, the Food and Drug Administration Revitalization Act.

This legislation addresses many critical issues, including the need for provide proper incentives and support for the development and review of pharmaceuticals and medical devices, including products for children, and the need for heightened efforts to assure the safety of those products.

As we debate this legislation, let us remember we all have the same goals in mind.

We want Americans to benefit from life-saving, life-enhancing drug and device products.

We want Americans to access to drugs that are safe and effective.

We want Americans to have access to a relevant safety information available on the Internet.

And, indeed, we want Americans to know that the Food and Drug Administration, the agency responsible for ensuring drug and device safety, has the resources to do its job.

That is what this bill is all about protecting Americans and giving the FDA the tools to do its job.

The legislation before us reauthorizes both the Prescription Drug User Fee Act, better known as PDUFMA, and the Medical Device User Modernization Fee Act, better known as MDUFMA.

It is of critical importance that both programs be authorized by the end of the fiscal year. This legislation embodies the agreements reached by both industries and the FDA, along with refinements added by the Congress.

Let me make clear that I am supportive of these reauthorizations. It is fair to say that I had reservations about MDUFMA, many of which are located in Utah. Indeed, I am proud that there are over 100 medical device companies in Utah, companies that represent the best in American innovation. They are true world leaders in their industry.

The changes made in the last reauthorization at my request, along with the new structure of the user fee in FDARA and the improved trigger provisions that consumers are being fairly treated by the user fee program in this bill. And, indeed, this is a serious concern.

In February of 2006, the Lewin Group prepared a report for the FDA entitled “Medical Device User Fee Modernization Act: Implications.” That report revealed that senior industry experts felt FDA is generally doing an excellent job in premarket regulation of medical devices and that the industry was generally supportive of the purpose and goals of MDUFMA. However, key among the findings was the fact that the industry perceived little or no evidence of attaining the main intent of the program or in realizing a favorable return on investment from user fees. In response to that fact, to meet with medical device executives, I hear the same concern. And it is a concern I share.

Indicative of that concern is the astounding fact that 70 percent of respondents agreed manufacturers perceived that MDUFMA goals have not resulted in meaningful improvements in either the predictability or timeliness of reviews. In fact, when I reviewed the device approval times, I understand the consequence for some classes of devices, FDA had made great progress. For others not. This was disturbing to me, since we would all hope that progress would have been made across the board.

It is my hope with the new fee structure embodied in S. 1082, we will make better progress in achieving the approval time goals.

I am pleased that Chairman KENNEDY and Senator Enzi included provisions at my request which make such policies for smaller companies are affordable.

Let me turn to the issue of direct-to-consumer advertising, or DTC. This is an issue on which our colleagues, the senior Senator from Kansas, Mr. PAT ROBERTS, has shown great leadership, both in the HELP Committee, and here in the Senate.

Chamber Senator Roberts has led the charge to eliminate the 2-year moratorium on prescription advertising for newly approved drugs. He has expressed constitutional concerns about the Illuminati. I share those concerns. He is right to bring this up.

In general, I believe we should be guided by a very simple rule. Advertising about products the FDA regulates should be truthful and not misleading.

I do understand the arguments that some in this body make with respect to pharmaceutical advertising. Some nights, when I watch television, those ads do become tiresome. But I could say that about a lot of ads.

Some have argued we need to be particularly careful about what pharmaceutical advertising is allowed, because we have limited knowledge about drugs, especially when they come on the market.

Those who make such arguments fail to recognize that FDARA will give the FDA more authority to review and react to drug safety data. User fees created by S. 1082 will bolster the FDA office responsible for reviewing drug advertising.

The FDA has told my office and others that drug manufacturers cooperate fully with the FDA when a concern is raised about an advertisement. That would be my preference for how these ads should be handled.

I am hopeful we will be able to address this issue and I am encouraged by recent discussions involving the Senator from Kansas and others members of the Senate HELP Committee.

The bill before us has benefited from the guidance of former Chairman Gregor and Senator BURR, who have pointed out the necessity for more flexibility in determining when to evaluate and mitigation plan—or REMS—is needed.

Senator Coburn added greatly to the discussion by raising the issue relating to the access of our constituents in rural areas to needed pharmaceuticals.

We are the product of this discussion is the appropriate balance. It requires, for example, that determining whether the FDA should further assess the safety of a drug should be based on scientific evidence. To me, that is probably the most integral part of this bill—when concerns are raised about drugs, these concerns must be based on scientific evidence and not on inuendos or hearsay. This approach allows proper evaluation of relevant information and gives the FDA greater authority to warn consumers when there are problems.

In addition, the drug safety provision strengthens the FDA’s existing authority to monitor drugs once they have been approved by making it clear that evaluation must occur before and after approval. One of the most important components of this legislation is that more drug safety information will be made more available to the public. I believe that is an important victory for the American consumer.

I also want to take a few minutes to talk about the pediatric testing and research provisions included in this bill.
I have supported both the Best Pharmaceuticals for Children Act and the Pediatric Research Improvement Act. In fact, I have supported these efforts since our former colleague from Ohio, Senator MIKE DEWINE, brought the need for pediatric testing of prescription drugs to our attention during consideration of the FDA Modernization Act of 1997. He fought long and hard to encourage drug companies to conduct clinical trials on pediatric uses of their drugs. His efforts paid off, and this program has been extremely successful.

My good friend and colleague from Connecticut, subcommittee Chairman CHRIS DODD, has also shown great leadership on this issue when FDA was being considered in 1997. He held a hearing on this issue earlier this year with his ranking Republican member, Senator LAMAR ALEXANDER. That hearing was very insightful and I believe that we are trying to do the right thing as we reauthorize both programs.

I urge my colleagues not to lose sight of the purpose of these two programs as we move forward on this part of the bill. We want good, solid information about the safest way to prescribe drugs for children. And by giving companies market exclusivity to conduct clinical trials, we will know the safest dosage levels continuing. So let us not lose sight of the original propose of these programs—to help children have the safest dosages for prescriptions. I hope that we will be able to work out our differences on these provisions on the Senate floor.

Food safety is another issue that is on nearly everyone’s mind these days. When I was a kid, we were always told to eat our spinach so we could grow muscles like Popeye. Peanut butter is almost an American meal by now. Yet, and these ordinary, common foods have harmed rather than helped. Pets are getting sick and we have discovered that their food has been contaminated. Something needs to be done.

I have worked with Senators KENNYDY, ENZI, DURBIN and ALLARD to figure out a constructive approach to these important issues. I think that we have made a lot of progress and I look forward to continuing those discussions as the bill progresses toward enactment.

One factor that is not discussed enough is the need to appropriate more funding for inspectors and inspector training, especially abroad. I can recall over a decade though when Jim Phillips, a former investigator for the FDA, brought to our attention the woefully lacking FDA resources for foreign inspections. We were shocked then, and unfortunately, we are shocked now.

Today, only one percent of imported food is inspected. I believe this issue needs to be carefully reviewed by Congress so people no longer have to worry about whether food for them or their pets is safe.

I offered and withdrew an amendment during the HELP Committee con-

consideration of this bill that would address another important issue. My amendment had seven provisions which encouraged innovation and development of safe antibiotics, required the FDA to convene a meeting to determine how the Orphan Drug Act should be applied and re-authorized the grant programs for the Orphan Drug Act. Finally, my amendment provided for a 5-year exclusivity for enantiomers of previously approved racemic drugs if and only if, one, they are approved at the same time and, two, a completely new data set has been created for approval of this enantiomer. It is my expectation that our current discussions on these provisions will lead toward their adoption later in the week.

I also want to point out that there have been many discussions on ways to ensure that citizens’ petitions do not unfairly delay generic drug approvals. I believe this is a problem, although I do not believe it is a problem to include as some would suggest. I do not oppose making changes to ensure that any abuses in this area are stopped, as long as FDA still has the ability to do the appropriate scientific and legal review of abbreviated new drug applica-

tions in the timeframe it desires.

Let me turn now to one provision which is not in the bill: language authoriz-
ing a pathway for the Food and Drug Administration to approve copies of a biologic drug by referral to a foreign company to act as the “biosimilars,” “biogenetics,” or “follow-on biologics” legislation. Senator GREGG spoke so well about this subject just a few minutes ago.

While language on this issue is not included in the bill we consider today, I want to make perfectly clear that it is my intention to work toward develop-

ment of an acceptable compromise that can be included in the final version of FDARA and signed into law. It will not be the FDA’s intent to offer any amendments on this issue until we have time to develop consensus. And I do believe consensus can be developed without delay. It is my intention to do so.

As my colleagues are aware, I am the Hatch of Hatch-Waxman. I have a serious interest in making certain the law Chairman WAXMAN and I developed in 1984, the Drug Price Competition and Patent Term Restoration Act, is used with the purposes it intended to serve. I believe we need to modernize the Hatch-Waxman law to help children have the safest dosages for prescriptions. This is a classic win-win situation.

And why is that so important? A February report by the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services paints the picture very well: America’s health care spending in the next 10 years will double to $4.1 trillion. Or, to look at it another way, that is 20 cents out of every dollar spent. We spend about $7,500 per capita on health care in the U.S. Yet in 2016, that will rise to an average of $12,200 per person. Spending on pharmaceuticals is expected to fuel much of the increase, the report’s authors concluded.

And there it is in a nutshell. The good news and the bad news. Not much worries Congress more than the costs of medical care—both from the perspective of a balanced budget, and from the view of our constituents’ pocketbooks.

In many ways, it is an embarrassment of riches.

We have exciting new therapies to treat our medical ills—new drugs, new devices, stem cell treatments. Their potential to improve human health and well-being is almost limitless.

And yet the cost of those treatments, the impact they have on the budget, at times seems equally limitless. In fact, in 2005, prescription drug spending was estimated at $214 billion, a healthy amount by anyone’s measure. That same year, spending on biologics was estimated at $22 billion.

Since biologicals are generally more expensive products, ways to reduce their costs interest policymakers and
other stakeholders in expenditure of the health care dollar, foremost among them employers, insurers, pharmacy benefits managers, and of course, the government.

Comes now the generic drug industry, a proven proven to improve alternative, safe and effective therapies in a much more cost beneficial manner. We look to them to be part of the solution to this problem. And they, in turn, look to us to help them be part of that solution.

I do not suggest that several senators have been meeting to develop a bill that would establish a pathway for bio-similar products to be approved by the Food and Drug Administration. We had hoped to have it ready for inclusion in FDARA, but it was not, despite the talks of the four Senators. I am referring to Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee Chairman Ted Kennedy, the committee’s ranking Republican, Mike Enzi, Senator Hillary Clinton and Senator Chuck Schumer, who have introduced the companion to the Waxman bill. Their legislation, the Waxman bill, is an important point for discussions. It is an important point for discussions. It is an important point for discussions. It is an important point for discussions. It is an important point for discussions.

Indeed, there are about 1,400 biotech companies in the United States. How many of them are profitable? Astonishingly, only 20.

Many of these companies are small, with revenues of under a million dollars per year. Many do not even have a product on the market.

We must ask ourselves the issue of who will be making biosimilars? Will it be the Barr Labs and Teva of the world? Undoubtedly.

But it may also be generic subsidiaries of innovator companies.

It is also very likely to be companies in India and China. As we have seen with the recent concerns over pet food, inspecting foreign manufacturing plants has historically been a problem for the resource-constrained Food and Drug Administration.

Before I close, I want to talk about the possibility that one day there will be an entire world. And it is my hope it can be included in the final version of FDARA that emerges from the conference committee.

And I must digress at this point to underscore that the FDA must be cash-strapped and that situation simply must be corrected. The dire FDA resources issue appears to have manifested itself in such recent revelations as to the inadequacy of food inspections for some of the most ubiquitous products in American life, including pet food and peanut butter.

Federal policymakers must take this into account when legislating, and the Food and Drug Administration Revitalization Act is a good place to start.

Enacting follow-on legislation is a top priority for me. I want us to finalize a bill on a priority basis, and it is my hope it can be included in the final version of FDARA that emerges from the conference committee.

Before I close, I want to talk about one other issue that is often debated when FDA-related legislation is considered on the floor: importation of prescription drugs. This morning, I listened to our colleague, Senator Dorgan from North Dakota, Mr. Dorgan, talk about his legislation which allows prescription drugs from other countries to be imported into the United States from other countries. My colleague represents a district that islst a representation which I believe gives people the false impression that these drugs are originally manufactured in the United States, exported to another country and then imported back to the United States. I just want to clarify that this is not typically the case.

In addition, I saw the Senator from North Dakota hold up two bottles of...
Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, 4 years ago, I stood in this very spot and warned against an ill-advised invasion of Iraq. Today, the situation in Iraq has spiraled out of control, into a bloody, deadly, sectarian civil war. Yet the President and his team continue to call Iraq a “success” of the “stay the course” nonsense. While they do, thousands of brave young Americans place their lives in jeopardy every day. That reality is one this Nation and the world did not have to experience. It is a tragic reality, brought on by a war of choice and an occupation that has yielded neither stability nor reconciliation.

Four years ago today, the President signed on the deck of the USS Abraham Lincoln to declare, “Mission accomplished.” Four years ago—it feels like an age. For thousands of our soldiers and their families, and likely for the Iraqi people, it feels like a lifetime. How hard the President hopes that it will happen, and how we all wish or pray, and how wrong our President continues to be today.

Ralph Waldo Emerson said:

A foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds, adored by little statesmen and philosophers and divines.

No matter how many times the President wishes it were so, peace in Iraq will not be found at the barrel of an American gun. No matter how hard the President hopes that it will happen, and how we all wish or pray, and how wrong our President continues to be today.

Peace demands an Iraqi-led political solution to transcend the ethnic and sectarian divisions that are splitting the country apart—a political effort which, to date, the Iraqi Government has only begun in concert with U.S. forces occupying the Iraqi nation. Cross your fingers, pull out your lucky rabbit’s foot, even nail a horseshoe over the Oval Office door, but hoping for luck will never change the deadly dynamic.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.
people themselves. But plainly Congress offered a plan that could have meant a brighter future for Iraq, a future controlled by the Iraqi people themselves with continued support from the United States. But the President has flatly rejected that plan. It is a sad day for our Nation and for the world.

Before the war began, I urged the President to think through the consequences. There was no doubt as to the military outcome of the war. But he said there were no consequences. Our military might was certainly unquestioned. I was very concerned about the repercussions that would follow this certain military victory. Tragically, the repercussions I feared all have come to pass. Oh, how I wish, yes, how I wish that I had been wrong.

Once again, I urge the President to think through the consequences of his choices, the consequences of his rejection of this new plan for Iraq, the consequences of his rejection of the supplemental appropriation. I am concerned that the President is making a mistake. I do not like it. I do not come here with a grievance against our military. I love our troops, for our President—yes, I do—and I pray for our country, yes, for our country, and for the people of Iraq.

President Bush has chosen to hold hostage $100 billion for our troops to his, President Bush’s, policies, his failed policies. But his choice, his choice, is not the last word. Congress will get to work on a new version of the supplemental appropriations conference report. We, with the Lord’s will, will not delay, but we also will not stop our efforts to stand for what is right and to craft policies that reflect the true strength of America: humility, modesty, honesty.

We will continue to press for a strong, intelligent foreign policy that does not rely on military might alone. And we will not stop in our efforts to bring peace to Iraq and our troops home from war, so help me God.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MENENDEZ). The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. S. 1062 is before the Senate. The Landrieu amendment is currently pending.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Landrieu amendment be set aside and that I may be able to offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 990

Mr. DORGAN. I have amendment No. 990 at the desk. I ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN], for himself, Ms. SOWE, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mrs. MCCAUSSELL, proposes an amendment number 990.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in today’s RECORD under “Text of Amendments.”)

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I speak on behalf of myself and Senator SOWE and other cosponsors, including Senator STABENOW, Senator GRASSLEY, Senator MCCAIN, Senator PRYOR, Senator SANDERS, Senator WHITEHOUSE, and Senator MCCAUSSELL.

This amendment comes from a piece of legislation we have previously introduced dealing with the reimportation of prescription drugs, FDA-approved, lower priced prescription drugs that are sold in other parts of the world for much lower prices than they are priced in the United States. There are 33 cosponsors on the bill as it was introduced in the Senate. It seems clear to me that the best approach to advancing this legislation is to amend the amendment to the legislation that reauthorizes the Food and Drug Administration. Inasmuch as this subject deals with the FDA, it would provide funding for the FDA, guidelines for the FDA on reimportation of drugs. I am not going to speak at length today. I spoke earlier today. I intend to come back tomorrow morning to speak at some greater length.

I know my colleagues, Senator SOWE and Senator GRASSLEY and Senator STABENOW and Senator SANDERS, I have talked to him—I know others will wish to come and speak as well. But suffice it to say, we have a situation in this country today in which the U.S. consumer is charged the highest prices in the world for prescription drugs. That is just a fact. Today I held up two pill bottles on the floor of the Senate, identical bottles that contained the same prescription drug medicine made in Ireland. It was called Lipitor, for controlling cholesterol. The table bottles were FDA-approved, and the manufactured drug, FDA-approved plant in Ireland. The two bottles I held up today were different only in that one was sent to Canada and one was sent to the United States.

The one sent to the United States was priced nearly double the price of the medicine sent to Canada. But that is not unusual. The same thing would be accomplished with respect to that which was sold in Germany or Italy or France or Spain or England. They all pay much lower prices for the same prescription drug, the identical drug made in the identical plant—FDA-approved, sold all around the world, except the U.S. consumer is given the privilege of paying the highest prices in the world, in some cases 80 or 90 percent higher, in some cases 120 percent higher than others pay for the identical prescriptive drug.

Our point with this amendment simply is that if the global economy is going to work, why doesn’t it work for everybody? How about the little guy who is buying prescription drugs and is paying the highest prices in the world.

We have put together a piece of legislation with very significant safety precautions so that there are no safety issues at all. I mentioned today that Europe does this routinely. They have a parallel trading system in Europe. They have had it for a couple of decades. If you are in Canada and want to buy a prescription drug from France, no problem. If you are in Italy and want to buy it from Germany, no problem.

They have a parallel trading system that allows the consumers to access the best prices. It is only the American consumer that is disadvantaged by a sweetheart deal that allows the prescription drug industry to engage their own price controls, which means that we pay the highest prices in the world.

We have offered an amendment. We have 33 cosponsors on the underlying legislation. The amendment I offer on behalf of myself and Senator SOWE, bipartisan legislation, as I indicated—Senators GRASSLEY and MCCAIN, STABENOW, PRYOR, SANDERS, WHITEHOUSE, MCCAUSSELL. This is a good amendment. It is good public policy. I know the prescription drug industry, the pharmaceutical industry doesn’t like it. I understand that. I do not come here with a grievance against that industry. I just do not like their pricing policy. I do not like the fact that they say to the American people: You pay the highest prices in the world.

That is not fair. It ought to change. Our amendment is aimed to change it. Mr. President, I will speak at greater length on the subject tomorrow.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized.

Mr. HATCH. As usual, my dear friend from North Dakota is articulate, and he deserves to be listened to, but I disagree with him.

The Dorgan amendment allows individuals to import a qualifying drug, and this will pose an overwhelming set of resource burdens for the FDA, Customs, and other agencies, especially...
the FDA. It would, as I have mentioned before, create very significant safety concerns.

This amendment establishes a complicated system for the regulation of imported drugs. Now this system that he supports, he must hold and require a lot of money, more than all of the proposed fees could support.

Where would an already strapped Federal agency such as FDA get these additional dollars? So far we have not given L. K. to them. There have been estimates that these dollars would amount to so much that there is no way that we could give them enough money.

This amendment allows foreign-imported products to be approved for distribution in the United States even when they may not be bioequivalent to the FDA-approved products. Now the reason I cite is that because the letter from the FDA, this letter was sent to the Honorable BYRON L. DORGAN, Senator from North Dakota. This letter was sent April 10, 2007.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed at the conclusion of the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HATCH. In that letter, just to mention a couple of things, the Acting Deputy Commissioner for Policy, Randall W. Lutter, Ph.D.—let me just mention a couple of sentences.

He said: Nonetheless, the Agency continues to have concerns with enacting such a sweeping importation program and fears that individuals to import a qualifying drug from a non-U.S. country, but the task is daunting. FDA is doing its best to use its limited resources to stop the increasing flow of violative drugs into this country, but the task is daunting. FDA’s Office of Regulatory Affairs has inspectors working in the field who perform investigations pertaining to imported prescription drugs, a job that is not limited to inspections at ports-of-entry. Each day, however, thousands of individuals packages containing prescription drugs are imported illegally into the U.S., simply because the sheer volume has grown to exceed the capability of our inspectors. We estimate that approximately 1% of all prescriptions drugs are imported daily.

Mr. William Hubbard, Associate Commissioner for Policy and Planning, U.S. Food and Drug Administration

INTRODUCTION

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee, I am Mr. William Hubbard, Associate Commissioner for Policy and Planning at the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA or the Agency). With me is John M. Taylor, Associate Commissioner for Regulatory Affairs at FDA. We appreciate having this opportunity to discuss with you the issues relating to the importation of prescription drugs from the U.S. market. FDA has seen its number of counterfeit drug investigations increase four-fold since the late 1990s. Although counterfeiting was once a rare event, we are increasingly seeing large supplies of counterfeit versions of finished drugs being manufactured and distributed by well-funded and elaborately organized networks. At the same time, inadequately regulated foreign Internet sites have also become portals for unsafe and illegal drugs. For example, FDA recently worked with domestic law enforcement authorities to shut down a website that was advertising “FDA-approved” and “safe” European and Canadian drugs, but was actually responsible for importing ineffective, counterfeit drugs. Evidence strongly suggests that the volume of these foreign drug importations is increasing at a rate presenting an unprecedented difficult challenge for Agency field personnel at ports-of-entry, mail facilities, and international courier hubs, and our laboratory analysts and border and law enforcement partners.

FDA is doing its best to use its limited resources to stop the increasing flow of violative drugs into this country, but the task is daunting. FDA’s Office of Regulatory Affairs has inspectors working in the field who perform investigations pertaining to imported prescription drugs, a job that is not limited to inspections at ports-of-entry. Each day, however, thousands of individual packages containing prescription drugs are imported illegally into the U.S., simply because the sheer volume has grown to exceed the capability of our inspectors. We estimate that approximately 1% of all prescription drugs are imported daily.

Mr. Hatcher. In that letter, just to mention a couple of things, the Acting Deputy Commissioner for Policy, Randall W. Lutter, Ph.D.—let me just mention a couple of sentences.

He said: Nonetheless, the Agency continues to have concerns with enacting such a sweeping importation program and fears that individuals would likely swallow the bulk of cost-savings, preventing the American consumers from enjoying much, if any, practical benefit from such a program.

On safety concerns, he said:

We have safety concerns related to both the identification of unsafe or non-compliant drug products and about the substitutability for domestic products.

On identifying unsafe/noncompliant drug products, he said:

The section of the bill that would allow individuals to import a qualifying drug from a registered exporter would likely pose an overwhelming burden for the Agency and create significant safety concerns.

Just reading at random: S.232 would establish a complicated system for the regulation of imported drugs. This complicated system is so vast that it would be enormously resource-intensive, likely much greater than the proposed registration fees and inspection fees could support.

On a lack of substitutability, he said:

The proposed bill provides a mechanism for foreign imported products to be approved for distribution in the U.S. even though these products may not be bioequivalent to the FDA-approved product.

This letter is a serious letter. I don’t think we should ignore letters such as these in our zeal to resolve problems. I believe the distinguished Senator from North Dakota is very well intentioned. I have a tremendous regard for him and for his ability to explain things on the floor of the Senate.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record excerpts of the testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee on July 14, 2004, entitled “Examining the Implications of Drug Importation,” of Mr. William Hubbard, Associate Commissioner for Policy and Planning of the U.S. FDA.

Mr. Hubbard. There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

TESTIMONY: UNITED STATES SENATE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY EXAMINING THE IMPILICATIONS OF DRUG IMPORTATION

Mr. William Hubbard, Associate Commissioner for Policy and Planning, U.S. Food and Drug Administration

INTRODUCTION

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee, I am Mr. William Hubbard, Associate Commissioner for Policy and Planning at the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA or the Agency). With me is John M. Taylor, Associate Commissioner for Regulatory Affairs at FDA. We appreciate having this opportunity to discuss with you the issues relating to the importation of prescription drugs from the U.S. market. FDA has seen its number of counterfeit drug investigations increase four-fold since the late 1990s. Although counterfeiting was once a rare event, we are increasingly seeing large supplies of counterfeit versions of finished drugs being manufactured and distributed by well-funded and elaborately organized networks. At the same time, inadequately regulated foreign Internet sites have also become portals for unsafe and illegal drugs. For example, FDA recently worked with domestic law enforcement authorities to shut down a website that was advertising “FDA-approved” and “safe” European and Canadian drugs, but was actually responsible for importing ineffective, counterfeit drugs. Evidence strongly suggests that the volume of these foreign drug importations is increasing at a rate presenting an unprecedented difficult challenge for Agency field personnel at ports-of-entry, mail facilities, and international courier hubs, and our laboratory analysts and border and law enforcement partners.

FDA is doing its best to use its limited resources to stop the increasing flow of violative drugs into this country, but the task is daunting. FDA’s Office of Regulatory Affairs has inspectors working in the field who perform investigations pertaining to imported prescription drugs, a job that is not limited to inspections at ports-of-entry. Each day, however, thousands of individual packages containing prescription drugs are imported illegally into the U.S., simply because the sheer volume has grown to exceed the capability of our inspectors. We estimate that approximately 1% of all prescription drugs are imported daily.

Mr. Hatcher. In that letter, just to mention a couple of things, the Acting Deputy Commissioner for Policy, Randall W. Lutter, Ph.D.—let me just mention a couple of sentences.

He said: Nonetheless, the Agency continues to have concerns with enacting such a sweeping importation program and fears that individuals would likely swallow the bulk of cost-savings, preventing the American consumers from enjoying much, if any, practical benefit from such a program.

On safety concerns, he said:

We have safety concerns related to both the identification of unsafe or non-compliant drug products and about the substitutability for domestic products.

On identifying unsafe/noncompliant drug products, he said:

The section of the bill that would allow individuals to import a qualifying drug from a registered exporter would likely pose an overwhelming burden for the Agency and create significant safety concerns.

Just reading at random: S.232 would establish a complicated system for the regulation of imported drugs. This complicated system is so vast that it would be enormously resource-intensive, likely much greater than the proposed registration fees and inspection fees could support.

On a lack of substitutability, he said:

The proposed bill provides a mechanism for foreign imported products to be approved for distribution in the U.S. even though these products may not be bioequivalent to the FDA-approved product.

This letter is a serious letter. I don’t think we should ignore letters such as these in our zeal to resolve problems. I believe the distinguished Senator from North Dakota is very well intentioned. I have a tremendous regard for him and for his ability to explain things on the floor of the Senate.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record excerpts of the testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee on July 14, 2004, entitled “Examining the Implications of Drug Importation,” of Mr. William Hubbard, Associate Commissioner for Policy and Planning of the U.S. FDA.
events, some of which can be life-threatening. More commonly, if the drugs are sub-

potent or ineffective, they may suffer comp-

lications from the illnesses that their pre-

scription was intended to treat, without ever

knowing the true cause.

Patients also are at greater risk because there is little or no regulation of what they are getting when they purchase some of these drugs. Although some purchasers of drugs from foreign sources may receive genuine products, others may unknowingly buy coun-

terfeit copies that contain only inert ingre-

dients, legitimate drugs that are outdated and have been diverted from unscrupulous re-
sellers, or counterfeit or unapproved prod-

ucts that were improperly manufactu-

red. Furthermore, in the case of foreign-

based sources, if a consumer has an adverse drug reaction or any other problem, the con-

sumer may have little or no recourse either 

because the operator of the pharmacy often is not known, or the physical location of the 

seller is unknown or beyond the consumer's reach. FDA has only limited ability to take 

action against these foreign operators.

The Agency has responded to the challenge of importation by employing a risk-based en-

forcement strategy to target our existing en-

forcement resources effectively in the face of multiple priorities, including homeland secu-

rity, food safety and counterfeit drugs. How-

ever, this system, as it works today, is al-

ready overwhelmed by the number of incom-

ings that presents a significant ongoing challenge for the Agency.

Recent spot examinations of mail ship-

ments of foreign drugs to U.S. consumers re-

vealed that these shipments contain dangerous or unapproved drugs that pose po-

tentially serious safety problems. In 2005, 

inspectors found that the majority of the pack-

ages examined in these “blitzes” contained illegal drugs. Last summer, FDA and the U.S. Customs and Border Protection agency (CBP) conducted blitz examinations on mail shipments at the Miami and New York (JFK Airport) mail facilities in July, and the San Francisco and Carlson, California, mail facili-

ties in August. In each location, the agen-

seys examined packages shipped by international mail over a 3-day time span. Of the 1,153 ship-

ments examined, the overwhelming ma-

jority (88 percent) contained unapproved drugs. The drugs arrived from many countries. For example, 16 per-
cent entered the U.S. from Canada; 14 per-
cent came from Europe; 14 percent came from Thailand, and 8 percent were shipped from 

the Philippines.

Mr. HATCH. These are serious state-

ments by serious people. I don’t think we should ignore them. It is one thing to argue that you don’t like the phar-

maceutical companies, and many don’t. It is another thing to argue that these drugs that are going to be imported or reimported are absolute identical copies of those that are, and you should pay attention to what these people are saying.

I also ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the statement of a Customs officer who came and testified on the 113.

There being no objection, the mate-

rial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATOR ORRIN G. HATCH (R-UT) HOLDS HEARING ON DRUG IMPORTATION

Mr. HATCH. Ms. Durant. Ms. Durant. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, thank you for this opportunity to testify.

I’m Elizabeth Durant, director of trade compliance and facilitation in the Office of Field Operations at the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection.

Today I’d like to discuss with you CBP’s efforts to address the ever-increasing trend in the importation of pharmaceu-

tical products and controlled substances into the United States.

Although the focus of the CBP has shifted to protecting the United States from terrorist attacks, we also enforce over 400 re-

quirements for more than 40 other federal agencies at U.S. borders. These include the laws that govern the importation of illegal or unapproved pharmaceuticals that fall under the jurisdiction of the Food and Drug Administration, as well as controlled substances that are under the jurisdiction of the Drug Enforcement Administration.

The issue of U.S. consumers buying pre-

scription drugs from foreign sources has be-

come a significant concern. A growing num-

ber of Americans obtain their medications from foreign locations. However, the safety of drugs purchased from these sources can-

not be insured. Drugs produced outside the United States may be counterfeit. Counterfeiting can apply to both brand name and gen-

eric drugs when the source is deliberately and fraudulently labeled in a way that suggests that it is the authen-

tic approved product.

The CBP has worked with three avenues that pharmaceuticals are imported: Those that are purchased through the Internet and shipped through our international mail express sector; those that are shipped to the United States by individuals transiting our land borders; and bulk shipments of adulterated or counterfeit pharmaceuticals. During the course of the past year, we have taken sev-

eral steps to address each of these areas.

Millions of packages come through the mail and express sector every year. Thousands of packages, particularly in the mail, are found to contain illegal and ap-

proved pharmaceuticals. We also estimate that 10 million people cross the land border annually carrying unapproved products.

Additionally, we have found bulk pharmaceu-

tical shipments that were attempted to be imported through the mail potentially in-

dicating that these products could be mak-

ing their way to pharmacy shelves.

In order to address what is clearly a grow-

ning threat to our health, CBP has been working cooperatively with the DEA, the FDA, our U.S. Immigration and cus-

toms Enforcement, ONDCP and the Depart-

ment of Justice in an interagency working group directed at addressing issues related to the importation of prescription drugs and miscellaneous pharmaceuticals.

The working group has conducted regular meetings since January 2004 and has achieved several key accomplishments since its inception, including conducting a joint project strategy and execution known as Operation Safety Cap, which was designed to look at passenger importations of pharmaceu-

ticals from Mexico. The purpose was to evaluate compliance with laws related to the importation of prescription drugs.

During the course of the operation there were several types of returning U.S. residents receiving different medica-

tions than the ones they thought they were being prescribed.

In one instance there was no active ingre-

dient in the unmarked, undeclared bottle that was brought into the U.S. The overall seizure detention rate was nearly 7 percent of the number of individuals inspected, which was significant enough to warrant addi-

tional enforcement efforts at our land bor-

ders.

Based on an operation nicknamed “Operation Safeguard” that we have carried out over the last couple of years, we have found that the number of unauthorized shipments through international mail to be enormous. We have also found a significant number of these products do not contain an active pharmaceutical ingredient or sometimes contain substances such as starch or sugar.

Other problems include expired materials, unapproved products, improper use instruc-
tions, and products that are purchased under proper regulation. The variety of the pharmaceuticals that enter the United States via the mail do so in a manner that according to FDA violates present FDA and other requirements.

It is clear that the importation of pharma-

caceuticals and controlled substances remains an overwhelming problem for CBP. We are working with the FDA, the DEA, ICE and other regulatory agencies to develop a more practical and workable approach to solve this huge problem.

I want to thank you and the members of the committee for considering Customs and Border Protection’s role in the im-

portation of pharmaceuticals and controlled substances. This is an issue that speaks di-

rectly to our mission. We will continue to make every effort possible to work with the Congress and our fellow inspection agencies to address the health and safety concerns of the American people.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I look forward to responding to any questions today.

Mr. HATCH. It was a startling state-

ment. I know at least one Democratic Senator, who takes matters very seri-

ously and who was for importation or reimportation of drugs, was shocked at some of the testimony because she did not believe things could be as bad as they represented and was kind of shocked that they made a pretty darn good case that these matters are much more serious than some are taking them.
percent of the total marketplace. Today they are over 50 percent. Hatch-Waxman is the reason they are there. In every case, every year we have saved at least $10 billion for the consumers. What many in this body seem to ignore is that it is in the interest of the innovator companies to employ Hatch-Waxman in order to recoup that money in the few years that are left of their patent life. There may be others, but I can say this: They have very few years in which to recoup any money. It means that the innovator companies have very few years in which to recoup that billion dollars, upwards of a billion dollars. A few years ago, it was $900 million, the astounding figure to me. Now it is approaching a billion in some cases, maybe even more.

One reason for Hatch-Waxman was because one side wanted all drug price competition. They wanted 100 percent generics if they could get them. The problem is, there would not be any generics if they did not have the innovative companies doing the innovative drugs.

Mr. DORGAN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HATCH. Sure.

Mr. DORGAN. My friend from Utah did not mean to suggest those of us who are offering this amendment on a bipartisan basis are doing so for the purpose of politics, as he said. My expectation is, he would think this would be a thoughtful amendment that he disagrees strongly with, but I hope he would not suggest the motive is politics. CBO has suggested this bill will save $30 billion for the American consumer; $3 billion of which is for the Federal Government. This is a serious issue and a thoughtful issue. One might disagree, but I hope that one would not ascribe motives of politics to those of us on a bipartisan basis who are offering this amendment.

Mr. HATCH. I have heard some who I believe are using it politically in the Congress. But I would never ascribe that type of attitude to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota. I believe he is very sincere. I believe he is truly trying to represent the consumers in the best possible way. I just believe he is ignoring some of these comments and statements made under oath before committees of the Senate that fly in the face of what is being said here. I would like to see drug prices go down. There is no reason to work about it. I worked hard to get them reduced. That is what Hatch-Waxman is all about. But there are two sides to that. One was drug price competition, to make sure we could get drugs in generic form immediately, once they come off patent, which we did. The other, of course, is the patent term restoration so that we could give innovator companies some restoration of their patent life or market exclusivity so they could recoup the moneys, the extraordinary costs that are involved.

When I say I have heard some in the Congress who I think have exploited this for political purposes, I would never say that about my friend from North Dakota. I don’t particularly want to disparage anybody else, but I can say this: There have been some who have used this issue politically, and there is no doubt about it. I believe the Senator from North Dakota is articulate and means what he says and is doing so for the right reasons. Having said that, I don’t think we should ignore the testimony of these top people who have made the determination this could be a disaster for the American consuming public. I don’t think you can ignore those comments. I am suggesting that I hope people will read these comments, and I will put more into the record before we are through this debate. We all are interested in getting drug prices down. There is no question about it. I don’t think there is anybody in this Congress who has done more to bring drug prices down than I, through Hatch-Waxman. I have been over in the House and others who supported that bill. There is no question about it. I am as interested as anybody in making sure the consuming public is not ripped off.

On the other hand, these innovative drugs cost a lot of money to develop. When we get into follow-on biologics, it apparently costs even more for these large-molecule drugs that may not be readily duplicated. In fact, under current law, they are not readily duplicated. I am very concerned about this whole issue. I am very concerned about making sure that the record shows that we have brought out how serious this issue is and how serious the consequences are if people are wrong, if they happen to get this type of legislation through.

Let me add one other thing. I would suggest to my friend from North Dakota that the President has already said in this bill, he is going to veto it. I believe that veto will be sustained. I think it should be sustained. It is one thing to come out and argue for something such as this, but I would hope that he will withdraw his amendment because I would hate to see a bill as important to our country as this drug safety bill, a bill that has brought together Democrats and Republicans from the left to the right, a bill that would help to save as many lives as this bill will do, a bill that will help to save many of these drugs. That is why I think the FDA in a way that it should be brought, a bill that has the MDUPA and PDUFA moneys in, a bill that has

children’s programs in, I would hate to see this bill vetoed, but I would not blame the President one bit if he vetoes it based upon the testimony of scientists who have testified before our committees.

Frankly, I would think he would be right if he vetoed it. But be that as it may, I am only one Senator, and I think most people know I am very sincere in this area. I work very hard in these areas. I have a personal stake in all of these areas. I just want to make sure that our consuming public has every protection they possibly can. Unfortunately, it costs a lot of money to give them that protection. I wish there was some way we could bring those prices down.

Having said that, back in the early 1990s, I helped put through this body the FDA Revitalization Act. Among the purposes of that act was to create a unitary campus for FDA rather than have over 30 different locations in the greater metropolitan area around the District of Columbia, to have a central campus, state-of-the-art equipment, the latest technology, bring an incentive to bring the very best scientific minds we can into FDA. We all know the White Oak complex is being built now. It didn’t start until about 5 or 6 years ago. It is going to take another 10 years and probably cost a lot more than it would have had we done what that bill said we could do immediately. It was only an authorizing bill. The appropriators did not appropriate the funds to develop that campus. But we have to find a way of helping FDA. The sooner we get that campus and they have all of the integral online services and equipment and top-of-the-line approaches that they can bring to bear, we should be able to bring drug prices down through that. But we are a long way from the completion of White Oak, as we stand here today.

Frankly, at least we are doing it. At least we are going somewhere. I wish to address some of some of the distinguished Senator from Maryland, Bar- bara Mikulski, and others in the House who have worked very hard to make sure that the FDA revitalization approach finally comes to fruition.

One of the biggest problems we have in Government today is to get top scientists at FDA. We can’t pay them commensurate with scientists at the major pharmaceuticals or even the major generic companies. In fact, they could start at three times what we pay at FDA. So we have a very difficult time continuously getting top scientists to come and work at FDA. That is a big problem. It is a blessing that we have some of the best scientists in the world who are willing to sacrifice to do what they consider to be the important work of the Food and Drug Administration. This bill will help the Food and Drug Administration to do a better job, to make sure that the Food and Drug Administration and the courts work hand in hand with Congress and, in the end, benefit all of us who benefit so much from the work of the Food and Drug Administration.
I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

ROCKVILLE, MD, April 10, 2007.

Hon. BYRON L. DORGAN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Interstate Commerce, Trade and Tourism, Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Dear Senator Dorgan: Thank you for the opportunity to testify at the March 7, 2007, hearing on "Drug Importation: Policy Implications." Further, your letter of April 3, 2007, requesting that I provide written testimony, was received on the March 9, 2007, correspondence you sent in follow-up to that hearing.

Your correspondence included statements made by former FDA Commissioner, David Kessler, at an April 19, 2005, hearing entitled, "Examining S. 334, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to the importation of prescription drugs," held by the Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions. Dr. Kessler was focused on the issue of safety, resources, supply chain security, and standards for approval of foreign versions of FDA-approved drugs. You asked that I explain how pharmaceutical companies and the U.S. market access and drug safety considerations.

"S. 242 would establish a complicated system for the regulation of imported drugs. We believe the bill would create unnecessary resource-intensive, likely much greater than the proposed registration fees and inspection fees could support. The bill and its associated fees also do not appear to account for the costs of increased volume of packages likely to inundate the U.S., or address the accompanying and likely substantial enforcement costs that will arise as a result of legalizing importation as more unscrupulous vendors set up shop to circumvent the new U.S. system.

Lack of substitution

The proposed bill provides a mechanism for foreign imported products to be approved for distribution in the U.S. even though these products may not be bioequivalent to the FDA-approved product. This mechanism seems to by-pass the existing drug approval process for drug products that are not bioequivalent to an FDA-approved product, which is through the submission of a new drug application (NDA) that is thoroughly reviewed for safety and efficacy. Ultimately, the bill appears to establish for imported drugs an alternative to FDA's existing generic drug program.

The bill would allow non-bioequivalent products to be sold in the U.S. as approved "variations" of the innovator product under the existing NDA, which would create confusion for doctors and pharmacists in prescribing and/or dispensing of medications. In addition, the domestic and foreign versions of prescription drugs may become commingled in the drug supply chain. It is unclear whether FDA will be able to specify if he wants the foreign version or the original FDA-approved version when he gets his prescription filled at the pharmacy or receives medical treatment. The possibility of confusion is significant and poses a real public health concern as this increases the chance of error in prescribing and/or dispensing of medications.

We believe the bill creates complicated application and inspection requirements for imported foreign products. The FDA would be difficult to implement, as each foreign country has its own regulatory scheme and requirements for the information necessary to approve a drug product. In addition, the bill does not set enforcement tools and penalties to deter foreign entities from introducing counterfeit or otherwise substandard drugs into the U.S. drug supply chain.

APPROVAL OF FOREIGN VERSIONS

We believe the bill creates complicated application and inspection requirements for imported foreign products. The FDA would be difficult to implement, as each foreign country has its own regulatory scheme and requirements for the information necessary to approve a drug product. In addition, the bill does not set enforcement tools and penalties to deter foreign entities from introducing counterfeit or otherwise substandard drugs into the U.S. drug supply chain.

Pharmaceutical Mar-

We note that legalizing commercial importation may have unintended effects on protection of intellectual property and may reduce incentives for research and development, as noted in the 2004 report issued by the Health and Human Services' (HHS) Task Force Report on Drug Importation.

We have safety concerns related to both the identification of unsafe and or non-compliant drug products and about the substitutability of foreign products for domestic products.

Identifying unsafe/non-compliant drug products

The section of the bill that would allow individuals to import a qualifying drug from a registered exporter would likely pose an overview of the burden for FDA and U.S. Customs and Border Protection officials to examine adequately all of the personally imported drug products to ensure that they comply. In fact, the HHS Task Force Report found that it would cost $3 billion annually to examine and process each of the 10 million packages that
often is more expensive than the U.S. product. In addition, the consumers are at risk when receiving foreign drug products, as there are documented cases where the wrong medication was received (the hypothetical case mentioned in my testimony). Many pharmaceutical companies and Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America (PhRMA) have acknowledged this and sometimes even free medications for consumers who cannot afford them. Medicare Part D has also helped some seniors cut their prescription costs. Consumers should not feel restricted to higher priced innovator (brand) products.

Consumers must also understand that if a medication is costly, they should discuss other treatment options with their doctor and pharmacist, as most often there are lower-cost alternatives available. We will continue to strive to make more affordable medicines available to consumers, but we remain concerned about the implications of legalizing drug importation as one of those options.

In conclusion, I would like to reiterate concerns about the economic implications of prescription drug importation, as stated in the 2009 House Force Report on Drug Importation. Even if all the safety concerns could be allayed, these concerns would remain: that savings to U.S. consumers would be small as a percent of total drug spending; and that these are usually less expensive in the U.S. than abroad. We thus have a well-functioning system of intellectual property rights that balances the short-term interests of consumers with the long-term research incentives.

Thank you for the opportunity to address some of our concerns with S. 242.

Sincerely,

RANDALL W. LUTTER,
Acting Deputy Commissioner for Policy.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed as in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXONERATION OF SENATOR FRIST

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, a great injustice has come to an end. I rise to recognize the clearing of a good man’s name.

Former Senator Bill Frist, with whom I and my Republican colleagues had the honor of serving for 12 years in the Senate, was cleared last week of every allegation of wrongdoing related to his ownership and sale of stock while serving as majority leader.

I rise because, with the exception of an editorial in this morning’s Wall Street Journal, the clearing of this good and honorable man’s name has gone largely unreported.

It is a sad day in political life in America that the mere allegation of wrongdoing—the mere allegation of wrongdoing—has the power to tarnish someone’s name and dog them for years. But worse still is the silence that so often greeets the vindication of the accused.

I remember the rush to judgment that followed the allegations. I remember the memo Democrats sent out attacking Bill Frist. The authors were later forced to apologize, but the piece had its intended effect.

Republicans knew then—and everyone now knows—those allegations were absolutely false. But, the damage, of course, was already done. As the Journal writers put it today:

Despite flimsy evidence, the media storm cast a shadow over [Frist’s] office . . . and the Nashville heart surgeon chose . . . to take a sabbatical from public life.

[And] Dr. Frist now joins a long line of public servants to be smeared on page one and [then] exonerated next to the classifieds, only to wonder if anyone noticed.

Well, his friends noticed. Still, it is hard not to lament the damage these reckless claims have caused—caused for Bill, his family, and potentially our political culture.

The Founders envisioned a nation in which citizen legislators would be willing to leave the plow and the workbench to serve.

Bill embodied this ideal by leaving his profession and the comforts of private life for a career of public service. He graced this body with his intelligence, his thoughtfulness, and his vision.

We can only hope that future citizen legislators, and judges, are not deterred from entering and elevating political careers because of the threat of similar treatment.

A great American statesman once said: Reputation is like fine china and glass—easy to crack, but hard to mend.

We hope a political culture that allowed the abuse of Bill Frist’s good name for political gain does not deter others from choosing the same path that he chose—and so honorably followed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled “Frist’s Vindication” from today’s Wall Street Journal be printed in the Record.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 1, 2007]

FRIST’S VINDICATION

When insider-trading allegations against former Senate Majority Leader Bill Frist surfaced back in 2005, they were splashed on the pages of major newspapers from coast to coast. Now that Dr. Frist has been vindicated, the silence is instructive. Is anybody out there?

Senator Frist was alleged to have received an insider tip and then sold shares in a hospital company run by members of his family. The Securities and Exchange Commission and Justice Department investigated for 18 months, and last week the SEC announced that it had conducted without taking action—that is, the doctor was cleared. Thanks in part to his meticulous email archives, Dr. Frist was able to show that he had begun the sale of his BCA stock in April of 2005, months before he was alleged to have received the inside whispers.

The controversy surrounding his involvement in health care was a perennial bugaboo for Dr. Frist. For years he was harassed by such liberal lobbies as Public Citizen, and was viewed as a pariah by the ethicists in Washington, which alleged conflicts of interest. These groups objected even to those stocks he held in the blind trust he had created to avoid the perception of conflict of interest. Yet when he sold those stocks, with a possible eye on higher office, he was pilloried for doing what the ethicists had asked him to do all along.

Today, even this muted abdution is surely a relief to Dr. Frist. Yet it’s impossible to undo the damage to his political career. Democrats naturally cared less about the actual facts than about pinning another scandal on Congressional Republicans in the run-up to the fall elections. But what about others who thought it clever or funny or perhaps mandatory to get their share of media attention by confusing accusation with proof of wrongdoing?

American University Professor James Thurber got his name in the paper for quipping that Senator Frist “came in like Jimmy Stewart and walked out like Martha Stewart.” What a card. As for the press corps, it ran off in a braying stampede in pursuit of the theme du jour, which was Abramoff-Delay-GOP corruption. The accusations against Dr. Frist fit that template, so there was no need for the herd of independent minds to inspect the evidence and draw distinctions. As the above editorial from the day now looks especially embarrassing—and unfair.

As a medical professional with strong Tennessee roots, Bill Frist was the kind of person we’d hope would occasionally choose to participate in politics, as opposed to the permanent political class that now dominates Congress. That his previous engagement in the real world, even carefully and transparently managed, made him an unfair target of political attacks shows why so few people, if so accomplished, run for office.

These are the kind of people that the goo-goo Naderites and their media acolytes end up driving from public life.

Frist now joins a long line of public servants to be smeared on page one and exonerated next to the classifieds, only to wonder if anyone noticed. As former U.S. Secretary of Labor Robert Reich, in his legal ordeals, “Which office do I go to to get my reputation back?”

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The assistant majority leader is recognized.

IRAQ SUPPLEMENTAL

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, about 1 hour ago, the President of the United States vetoed the supplemental appropriations bill for the war in Iraq. It was a decision that we have long awaited in Congress since its arrival in the middle of February. It was the subject of lengthy deliberations. There were long debates on the floor of the House and Senate. There was a lot of compromise that led up to the final work product and a bipartisan compromise, the evidence, the evidence, the evidence, the evidence, the evidence, the evidence, the evidence, the evidence, the evidence.
of Representatives could rise to this challenge. In a nation that is so divided on so many political issues, in a nation where the war in Iraq is the biggest issue by far, there were serious doubts as to whether this Congress, with scant majorities of Democrats in both the House and the Senate, could override a bill for President Bush to consider.

Congress rose to that occasion. With the leadership of Speaker Pelosi and the leadership of our majority leader, Harry Reid of Nevada, we produced a bill with not only overwhelming support of the Democratic caucus but also the support of Republican Senators who joined us in passing this bill.

It was our hope that our work product would be considered seriously by the President. It was sent to him this afternoon. A few hours after receiving it, the President vetoed it and announced his veto in a public press conference.

I am disappointed. The President had a chance to sign a bill that would have funded the troops in this war. More importantly, it was a bill he could have signed which could have changed the course of this war—something that is long overdue.

I listened in my office as the President gave his veto message to the American people. It was short, direct but, in many ways inadequate when you consider the awesome responsibility we face in Congress and in the White House.

The President referred to our timetable to start bringing American troops home as a date for failure. It is ironic the President would make that statement on the fourth anniversary of his appearance on the USS Lincoln aircraft carrier under a banner announcing, 4 years ago, that our mission was accomplished. For the President to announce success and failure, accomplish and lack of accomplishment, leaves something to be desired after that experience 4 years ago.

I am particularly troubled as well by the President’s notion of what this bill was all about. You see, he said, at one point, for us to set a timetable to bring American troops home would—in the President’s words—‘demoralize the Iraqi people.’ Those were his words.

Mr. President, excuse me, but I am not as interested in building up the morale of soldiers as I am in inspiring the leaders of the nation to stand up and lead. For too long now, with the protection of the U.S. troops, this Iraqi Government has failed to make even basic progress in taking control of their country. They have failed to address the key political issues that would lead to stability.

So the President is arguing that if we continue to send 150,000 or more American soldiers to risk their lives, it will build up the morale of the Iraqi people to serve them stability and peace. So we expect American soldiers to stand in this crossfire of a bitter religious and civil war, hoping that the Iraqi people will be inspired enough to ask their Government for leadership?

Mr. President, 3,351 American soldiers have fought and died in Iraq, as I stand here today. Mr. President, 3,351 American lives should be enough to inspire the Iraqi people and their Government. Could we imagine that 3,351 American lives will it take for that inspiration the President is looking for?

I am troubled by this notion that unless we will sacrifice our treasure and the lives of our soldiers, the Iraqis cannot rise to the occasion and lead themselves out of this morass.

I also listened to the President when he characterized the money that we added in Congress to his budget request. He called it—and I will quote—‘billions in nonemergency spending that has nothing to do with fighting the war on terror.’

I wonder if the President’s staff put the bill in front of him for him to take a close look at, in the few hours he had it before even vetoing it.

Is the President arguing to the American people that providing $2 billion more in equipment to keep our troops safe in Iraq has nothing to do with fighting the war on terror?

Is the President arguing that the $1 billion in our supplemental appropriations bill—the $1 billion to replenish National Guard equipment destroyed and lost in the war in Iraq—that $1 billion has nothing to do with the war on terror?

Is the President arguing that the $2 billion in this bill for military hospitals—such as Walter Reed, so we do not relegate our fallen soldiers and those who were injured to a flophouse motel across Georgia Avenue from Walter Reed Hospital—is he arguing that the $2 billion that is in the bill for military hospitals has nothing to do with the war on terror?

Perhaps the President is not aware of the fact that the third line in this bill for veterans hospitals all across America, for those who have come home with post-traumatic stress disorder, traumatic brain injury, and amputations who need the services of the VA hospitals. Is the President arguing that money for VA hospitals has “nothing to do with the war on terror”? That is what he said. That is an exact quote.

This bill has add-ons that relate to real emergencies in America. I have our troops in Iraq and what it has done to America. Then they will join us. Then this will truly become a bipartisan effort. Then we will be able to override vetoes and pass legislation that will make a meaningful change in the policy of this war.

I encourage those across America seeking a new direction in Iraq, do not be discouraged by this veto. There will be another day. There will be another bill. There will be another chance for us to change this policy. We need to keep our tongues together—the voices for change in Iraq on the Democratic side and on the Republican side. We cannot allow the President’s veto pen to be the
last word on this war in Iraq. We have to stand together, and we have to work together.

The President comes up with rosy reports on what is happening in Iraq. But we know the reality. Sectarian deaths are down, but the violence is up. We told the American people that there would be a bigger war in Iraq than the one in Vietnam, and yet that is the largest part of our efforts in Iraq. We are down slightly, a small percentage, of those innocent civilians killed last month. There were fewer this month. I guess that is progress. But those who are there say the violence is subsiding while the tension is increasing, and they are afraid it will return. I am, too.

We need to pass a bill for the troops, and sometime soon. We will work hard to try to find a way with the President. He has invited the leadership of the Senate and the House to meet with him tomorrow in the White House. I have been to those meetings before. There have been little results to point to for the time we have met and the dialogue we have exchanged. But I go tomorrow with the hope that things will be different. Mr. President, after this moment in the sun with this veto, will understand that we face the grim reality of Iraq, and the reality that we have no exit plan. This failed policy in Iraq must come to an end. We will continue this fight, and I encourage other members of this Chamber to stand together, and we have to work hard and sometime soon. We will work hard to try to find a way with the President.

The bottom line is very simple: that we are fighting terrorism and directing counterterrorism and not simply policing a civil war.

The next few weeks will be momentous in our history. Frankly, when these few weeks began, the President, with his bullying, his harsh rhetoric, his idea that he was trying to persuade people we didn’t support the troops, many thought he would win the fight—the fight here in this Chamber and in the minds of public opinion. But that hasn’t happened at all. In fact, the American people are so disgusted by this, that the old name-calling, the old knee-capping, the old attempts to instill fear in people who disagree with him don’t work for this President anymore. He has only one choice. That choice is a simple one, which is to change the course of the war in Iraq. It is inevitable. It will happen. It will happen sooner or it will happen later, but it must happen because failed policies can never continue on and on and on.

They asked us to have faith in the Surge. If it won’t work with 150,000 troops, it won’t work with 180,000 troops, and it won’t work because the Government in Iraq does not have the support of the people, is unable to accomplish its goals. Should we bring in the Sunnis, Shiites, and Kurds together. It doesn’t matter how many troops we have there; the bottom line is simple. Our President is in the twilight days of his administration, and he has only two choices. One is to do what his predecessor Ronald Reagan did: See that things have gone off course and seek a correction. Ronald Reagan did that in 1986, and by 1988 the wall came down and Ronald Reagan had restored the faith of the American people. Why this President can’t see the necessity to do the same when his policies, if anything, are in far worse shape than those of President Reagan, speaks either to an inability to sense what is going on or a stubbornness despite the facts. We can’t tolerate that.

We here tonight make a pledge to the American people. We will continue this struggle to change our direction in Iraq. We will not run away from fighting terrorism. We believe it every bit as fervently as anybody else, but we will also not run away from fighting terrorism smartly, which is what we are not doing here.

So we will continue to try to reach a compromise with this President, to try to figure out a way we can both support the troops and change the course of the war in Iraq in maybe a different way, but we will not give up on our mission. The American people demand no less and we will not disappoint them.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The bottom line is very simple: that President Bush, when he asked Americans to go to war, never talked about policing a civil war, and yet that is the largest part of our efforts in Iraq. We on this side of the aisle hope to change that direction so that we are fighting terrorism and directing counterterrorism and not simply policing a civil war.

President Reagan did that in 1986, and by 1988 the wall came down and Ronald Reagan had restored the faith of the American people. Why this President can’t see the necessity to do the same when his policies, if anything, are in far worse shape than those of President Reagan, speaks either to an inability to sense what is going on or a stubbornness despite the facts. We can’t tolerate that.

We here tonight make a pledge to the American people. We will continue this struggle to change our direction in Iraq. We will not run away from fighting terrorism. We believe it every bit as fervently as anybody else, but we will also not run away from fighting terrorism smartly, which is what we are not doing here.

So we will continue to try to reach a compromise with this President, to try to figure out a way we can both support the troops and change the course of the war in Iraq in maybe a different way, but we will not give up on our mission. The American people demand no less and we will not disappoint them.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The bottom line is very simple: that President Bush, when he asked Americans to go to war, never talked about policing a civil war, and yet that is the largest part of our efforts in Iraq. We on this side of the aisle hope to change that direction so that we are fighting terrorism and directing counterterrorism and not simply policing a civil war.

The next few weeks will be momentous in our history. Frankly, when these few weeks began, the President, with his bullying, his harsh rhetoric, his idea that he was trying to persuade people we didn’t support the troops, many thought he would win the fight—the fight here in this Chamber and in the minds of public opinion. But that hasn’t happened at all. In fact, the American people are so disgusted by this, that the old name-calling, the old knee-capping, the old attempts to instill fear in people who disagree with him don’t work for this President anymore. He has only one choice. That choice is a simple one, which is to change the course of the war in Iraq. It is inevitable. It will happen. It will happen sooner or it will happen later, but it must happen because failed policies can never continue on and on and on.

They asked us to have faith in the Surge. If it won’t work with 150,000 troops, it won’t work with 180,000 troops, and it won’t work because the Government in Iraq does not have the support of the people, is unable to accomplish its goals. Should we bring in the Sunnis, Shiites, and Kurds together. It doesn’t matter how many troops we have there; the bottom line is simple. Our President is in the twilight days of his administration, and he has only two choices. One is to do what his predecessor Ronald Reagan did: See that things have gone off course and seek a correction. Ronald Reagan did that in 1986, and by 1988 the wall came down and Ronald Reagan had restored the faith of the American people. Why this President can’t see the necessity to do the same when his policies, if anything, are in far worse shape than those of President Reagan, speaks either to an inability to sense what is going on or a stubbornness despite the facts. We can’t tolerate that.

We here tonight make a pledge to the American people. We will continue this struggle to change our direction in Iraq. We will not run away from fighting terrorism. We believe it every bit as fervently as anybody else, but we will also not run away from fighting terrorism smartly, which is what we are not doing here.

So we will continue to try to reach a compromise with this President, to try to figure out a way we can both support the troops and change the course of the war in Iraq in maybe a different way, but we will not give up on our mission. The American people demand no less and we will not disappoint them.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The bottom line is very simple: that President Bush, when he asked Americans to go to war, never talked about policing a civil war, and yet that is the largest part of our efforts in Iraq. We on this side of the aisle hope to change that direction so that we are fighting terrorism and directing counterterrorism and not simply policing a civil war.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, this is a cloture motion on Senator DORGAN’s longstanding endeavor to allow Americans to go to other countries for the importation of cheaper drugs. We know people are going to Canada now from the border, and it works pretty well. But if people are going to Canada now from around the country who live on the border, and it works pretty well. But if you are someone who lives in Nevada, you certainly need these drugs as well as someone living in Minnesota, and it makes it much more difficult. Nevadans go to Mexico a lot of times for cheaper drugs. It is unfortunate.

Senator DORGAN is right. He has worked on this very hard for a number of years. This is an effort to bring this matter to a close. I hope the Senate votes to invoke cloture so we can have a vote on this amendment. It is important. I am confident it will pass if cloture is invoked. It is something that has been needed for such a long time to help in one way to lower the cost of medicine for the American public.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent there now be a period of up to 10 minutes each. The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HONORING STEVEN SCHWARZ

Mr. REID. Mr. President, last week I attended a ceremony in the Capitol Rotunda to commemorate the 2007 Holocaust Days of Remembrance.

Fred Zeidman and Joel Geiderman, Chairman and Vice Chairman of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council, spoke eloquently about the horror and courage, the unspeakable tragedy and unimaginable heroism that even 62 years later we cannot begin to comprehend.

Sara Bloomfield, Director of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum, as well as my colleague, Senator JOE LIEBERMAN, added their own powerful words.

I was privileged to sit beside Steven Schwarz. As we sat together, Steven listened silently, tears streaming down his face. Afterward, he told me his story.

Born in Poland, Steven lost both parents and a brother in the Holocaust. Forged with sheer willpower and blessings from God, he, his late wife Tina, and his brother Henryk managed to survive by hiding out in Poland. In 1953, they came to the United States and were welcomed with open arms. In the years that followed, Steven and his brother rose to become prominent and successful businessmen, overcoming great suffering to live the American dream.

Steven Schwarz embodies the grace and fortitude of all those who wrested triumph from despair. I am honored to have shared that day of remembrance with him and pleased to now pay tribute to his life story in the RECORD of the U.S. Congress as a powerful and poignant example of the unbreakable human spirit.

AAA SCHOOL SAFETY PATROLLERS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I wish to recognize several young people who were recently selected by the American Automobile Association to receive special awards for their work as school safety patrolers.

More than 560,000 students in 52,000 schools across the country participate in AAA School Safety Patrol Program. These young people have taken on the important responsibility of making the streets around their schools safer for their classmates. Though their responsibilities are often routine, the patrolers on occasion must place themselves in harm’s way in order to save lives. It is my honor today to recognize two students who were selected to receive the AAA Lifesaver Award for their selfless and heroic actions in fulfilling their duties as patrolers.

Taylor Pitzer and Caleb Jarrell participate in the AAA School Safety Patrol Program at Southdale Elementary in Kettering, OH. On November 6, 2006, Taylor and Caleb pulled a younger child to safety when a speeding van ran the red light at the intersection they were patrolling. The younger child was watching carefully for the oncoming vehicle approaching the intersection. Responding to an adult guard’s “hold back” indication, Taylor and Caleb reacted quickly by locking arms so the child could not cross the street, which allowed the van to speed by without incident or injury to the child.

I would also like to thank AAA for making the school safety program possible. This program has helped save many lives over the years and has made our schools safer for our students, though, as the story of the Life Saver Award recipients demonstrate, the streets around our schools are not safe enough. That is why I worked to create the national Safe Routes to School Program, which was adopted as part of the Federal transportation bill on July 29, 2005. Funds for this program can help communities construct new sidewalks, school bus stops, and other safer routes. As well as launch Safe Routes education and promotion campaigns in elementary and middle schools.

I am pleased to commend this important program today before the Senate. I know I speak for every member of the Senate in expressing our gratitude for their valuable work in our communities.

NORTHERN NEVADA CENTER FOR INDEPENDENT LIVING

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I wish to honor the Northern Nevada Center for Independent Living, NNCIL. I am honored to congratulate this organization for their 25 years of dedicated service to the people of Northern Nevada.

NNCIL has helped disabled citizens in Nevada in all aspects of their lives. They have empowered disabled citizens to become more independent and have given disabled people a stronger voice in matters that directly affect their lives. With the skills taught by NNCIL, disabled people who were benefactors of this program are now participating fully in the community by volunteering in the center and in other service agencies across Nevada.

NNCIL has helped disabled citizens thrive socially as well. The center has instituted “recreation night” that has helped disabled people form peer support groups. They have incorporated game night and movie night into their organization to build communities throughout Nevada.

The efforts of NNCIL have garnered broad respect and support from the community as a whole. NNCIL has incorporated multiple programs to educate the public concerning issues concerning disabled citizens. They have encouraged Nevada residents to get involved in their communities, and the citizens of northern Nevada have responded by volunteering in a home modification program that has helped install ramps, handrails, and other improvements to make life easier for disabled people.

I would like to commend NNCIL for their many years of dedicated service to the people of northern Nevada, and their continued success.

RECOGNIZING NEVADA’S 45TH ANNUAL RENO JAZZ FESTIVAL

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I wish to recognize the 45th annual Reno Jazz Festival. Hosted by the University of Nevada, Reno, the Festival has grown into one of the largest of its kind in the United States, with over 10,000 people attending last year’s event.

The competition portions are the highlights of the festival. Musical groups and individuals from junior highs, high schools, and colleges from throughout the country are invited to participate. The contest will be held along with other highly acclaimed musical groups will perform at the festival’s showcase on its concluding day.