

took after receiving a leaked manuscript of a study prior to its publication on May 21, 2007 in *The New England Journal of Medicine* (NEJM). This study reported a link between heart attacks and Avandia, a drug GSK sells to control glucose levels in diabetics.

GSK representatives informed the Committee last summer that a peer reviewer leaked the study to them weeks before it was published. GSK later acknowledged to the Committee that the peer reviewer was Dr. Haffner. Dr. Haffner confirmed this fact noting also that he was peer reviewing the study for NEJM when he faxed the study to GSK. According to documents filed at the FDA, GSK has paid Dr. Haffner around \$75,000 in consulting fees and speaking honoraria since 1999.

Dr. Haffner told Committee investigators that no one at GSK asked him to send them this study about Avandia. Nonetheless, I am interested in what GSK did after receiving the study. Did GSK return the study to Dr. Haffner? Did GSK contact the NEJM to report this violation of publishing ethics? I would appreciate a detailed description of what GSK did after receiving the unpublished study regarding one of their leading drugs. Accordingly, please respond to the following questions and request for documents:

1. Please provide a list of all GSK employees who received and/or learned of the results contained in the leaked copy of the manuscript prior to publication by NEJM.

2. Please provide copies of all documents, records, and recordings of telephone messages regarding the NEJM manuscript that was leaked to GSK before publication.

3. Please provide the following dates:

a. When did GSK first contact the data safety monitoring board of the RECORD trial to begin publication of interim results?

b. When did GSK begin pulling together the interim data of the RECORD trial?

c. When did GSK submit the interim results of the RECORD trial to NEJM for possible publication?

4. Please provide copies of all documents, records, communications, and recordings of telephone messages regarding the publication of the interim results of the RECORD trial.

5. Please provide copies of any other pre-publication study drafts that GSK received about one of its products. Please do not include these drafts if a GSK employee was an author on the study. This request covers the period of January 1, 2000 to the present.

Thank you again for your continued assistance in this matter. I would appreciate receiving the documents and information requested by no later than February 15, 2008. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Paul Thacker or Emilia DiSanto of my Committee.

Sincerely,

CHARLES E. GRASSLEY,
Ranking Member.

FOREST CONSERVATION IN INDONESIA

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I want to take this opportunity to commend Indonesian President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono for his statements on December 10, 2007, at the Bali Climate Conference, concerning the Ministry of Forestry's "Strategy and Action Plan for National Conservation of Orangutans."

The President said "the survival of the orangutan is inextricably linked to the survival of its natural habitat: the rainforests. . . . [T]o save orangutans,

we must save the forests. And by saving, regenerating, and sustainably managing forests, we are also doing our part in reducing global greenhouse gas emissions, while contributing to sustainable economic development of Indonesia. Successful orangutan conservation is the symbol of responsible management of the earth's resources."

President Yudhoyono's eloquent words represent an important recognition by the Indonesian Government that preserving orangutan habitat is an environmental imperative, not only to protect this magnificent species from extinction but to help reduce carbon emissions resulting from the destruction of Indonesia's forests.

A decade ago I included funds in the Foreign Operations Act to support programs administered by the U.S. Agency for International Development to protect the orangutan. Those initial funds have evolved into an ongoing program implemented through grants to non-governmental organizations and for training of Indonesian police, and has begun to show encouraging results. Not only are the entities involved in this effort working more cooperatively together, the Indonesian Government is taking steps to curb illegal logging which poses the greatest threat to the orangutan's survival.

The orangutan's fate is far from certain. Far more needs to be done to protect the forests of Borneo and Sumatra where these great apes live. But by recognizing the opportunities this challenge presents for Indonesia and the world, President Yudhoyono has done a great service to this effort and gives us hope that the orangutan can be saved.

I ask unanimous to have an article in the *Telegraph* about President Yudhoyono's announcement of Indonesia's new Strategy and Action Plan printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the *Daily Telegraph*, Dec. 28, 2007]

INDONESIA PLANTS TREES TO SAVE ORANGUTANS (By Ian Wood)

At the Bali climate summit, Indonesia announced a new scheme aimed at protecting its orangutan population.

The plight of the orangutan, driven out because of deforestation and degradation of its rainforest home, has become a potent symbol of the battle to save the forests.

The most recent survey of wild orangutans estimates that there are about 7000 remaining in Sumatra, and about 55,000 in Borneo. However the combined pressures of palm oil, logging and forest fires are having a catastrophic effect on many areas.

Indonesian president Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono said at the launch of the project: "In the last 35 years about 50,000 orangutans are estimated to have been lost as their habitats shrank. If this continues, this majestic creature will likely face extinction by 2050. The fate of the orangutan is a subject that goes to the heart of sustainable forests . . . to save the orangutan we have to save the forest."

For anyone with an interest in protecting Indonesian rainforests these have to be welcome words.

The action plan has taken nearly three years to develop and has included various NGO's and the Indonesian forestry ministry. The American group The Nature Conservancy has represented the coalition of NGO's and has also pledged \$1 million to support the plan. The bold target of the project is to save huge areas of forest scheduled for conversion to palm oil.

"One million hectares of planned forest conversion projects are in orangutan habitat," said Rill Djohani, director of The Nature Conservancy's Indonesia program.

"Setting aside these forests is an important step for Indonesia to sustainably manage and protect its natural resources. It benefits both local people and wildlife while making a major contribution towards reducing global carbon emissions."

Indonesia has made some progress in enforcing forest laws over the last few years and if this plan can be implemented it would be a landmark in Indonesian forest protection.

Dr. Erik Meijaard, a senior scientist with The Nature Conservancy, said: "It could lead to 9,800 orangutans being saved and prevent 700 million tons of carbon from being released."

Although Indonesia has already destroyed huge swathes of rainforest, it still has over 100 million acres left. Both scientists and Indonesian officials hope that the emerging carbon market could provide funds to protect important areas.

"Forest conservation can provide economic benefits for a very long time," said Dr. Meijaard. "If payments for avoided deforestation become an official mechanism in global climate agreements, then carbon buyers will likely compensate Indonesia for its forest protection. Protecting the orangutan will then lead to increased economic development in the country. Such a triple-win situation is not a dream. With some political will, it can soon be reality."

The other target of the project is to return orangutans housed in rehabilitation centres to the forest by 2015. There are currently over 1000 orangutan housed in care centres with more arriving on a regular basis. The majority are ready to be returned to the wild now but there are simply not enough suitable release sites. If carbon trading could achieve the aims of this plan, then these great apes could return to the forests where they belong.

HELSINKI COMMISSION

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on the work of the Helsinki Commission.

The Helsinki Commission yesterday held an important hearing on combating anti-Semitism in the OSCE region. I would like to commend the two panelists who testified, Professor Gert Weisskirchen, MP and Dr. Kathrin Meyer. Professor Weisskirchen serves as the OSCE's chair-in-office personal representative on anti-Semitism, and Dr. Meyer serves as the advisor on anti-Semitism issues in the OSCE's Office for Democratic Institutions and human rights. Both of these scholars have been fighting against anti-Semitism for years, and their good work should be recognized. Modern anti-Semitism is an appalling relic of a past horror; and though it is not yet as acceptable as in ages past, its resurgence today is no less troubling.

We forget, sometimes, just how much the world is indebted to the Jewish

community. The world's culture has been immeasurably enriched by Jewish writers, scientists, artists, philosophers, and medical pioneers. All those contributions, however, mattered little when the shadow of fascism fell across Europe, and European nations began to destroy some of their most valuable sons and daughters.

We may have thought that the horrors of World War Two and the Holocaust had finally cauterized the old festering sore of anti-Semitism. And indeed, for some years, that seemed to be the case. Europe committed itself to ensuring that never again would its states do violence against their Jewish minority, to which it owed so much. But time is a powerful sedative. Today, much of the same toxic nationalism is again on the rise. One of the most troubling aspects to me of the past two decades has been the reemergence of virulently nationalist and xenophobic political parties. These groups have often drawn on the iconography and ideology of Axis powers during the Nazi period, with some going so far as to hold public rallies and marches. Others resort to violence, both openly and in the shadows. These gangs are not acceptable within European political society—not yet—but their emergence is a sign that once again, all is not well on the continent. Economic turmoil has combined with age-old anti-Semitism to offer a tiny sliver of legitimacy to burgeoning neo-fascist parties. In some of the newly free states of Eastern Europe, social turmoil has often provided opportunistic politicians the chance of blaming national problems on an ancient scapegoat—the Jews.

But this problem is not limited to the East. In much of Europe, in the highest centers of learning and culture, a new phenomenon serves to buttress these old prejudices. The Middle East, where the world's only Jewish state faces a sea of hostile terrorists, is particularly ripe for anti-Semitic propagandists. The world today sees much anti-Semitism masquerading as criticism of Israel. August world bodies, dedicated to forging peace, have seen some of their instruments twisted almost beyond recognition. When great institutions cannot rouse themselves to end appalling human rights abuses in virtually every corner of the world, but instead focus again and again and again on a tiny nation, liberal and democratic, alone in a hostile region—then the instruments of those institutions may well be broken. Anti-Semitism is a scourge from which we are still not free, not so long as radical agitators and tacit bigotry alike have a vested interest in blaming the ills of many on the perceived sins of a few. Because too often, in Europe, the few are the Jews.

The active steps to combat anti-Semitism proposed yesterday by Professor Weisskirchen and Dr. Meyer could prove exceptionally useful in rolling back today's creeping advance of radicalism and anti-Semitism. Only

through vigorous and proactive measures can we identify the seedlings of hate and discrimination, and uproot them, and ensure that never again would Europe or the world fall prey to the ancient base ugliness of the mob.

RICHARD REID CONVICTION ANNIVERSARY

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, most of the victories in the fight against terrorism have been won on foreign shores with little to no acclaim here at home. As our Nation continues the long and often silent campaign against extremism, we should not miss the opportunity to publicly praise the lifesaving achievements of our Nation's intelligence and law enforcement authorities.

On this day 5 years ago, al-Qaida operative Richard Colvin Reid, also called Abdul Raheem—but known to the world simply as the “shoe bomber”—was sentenced to life in prison. Reid sought to explode an airplane carrying 185 passengers and 12 crewmembers on their voyage across the Atlantic. Thanks to the vigilance and bravery of two flight attendants, Cristina Jones and Hermis Moutardier, Reid was discovered and detained, saving flight 63 and all on board.

The U.S. Attorney's Office in Massachusetts subsequently prosecuted Reid. His confession led to the first conviction of an al-Qaida terrorist on American soil. To commemorate the occasion, I met yesterday with the case's chief prosecutor, Middlesex County district attorney Gerry Leone. I took that opportunity to congratulate him on a successful conviction, one of the highlights of Gerry's long record of public service.

Like the terrorists of September 11, Reid pledged blind fealty to the hate-filled ideology of Osama bin Laden. In furtherance of his determined plot, Reid traveled to more than seven countries spanning three continents. Law enforcement authorities were able to use e-mails sent by Reid to obtain a vital glimpse into the complex global network of al-Qaida. These correspondences led authorities to discover al-Qaida-affiliated terrorist cells in London, France, and Turkey.

As we commemorate Reid's conviction and express our gratitude to those like Gerry Leone who made it happen, we must remember that future victories depend on private citizens, public servants, and law enforcement officers here and abroad working in unison to keep Americans safe against terrorism.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR TRENT LOTT

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. President, across America, those citizens who have on occasion chosen—or been required—to listen to congressional debate have often heard the Senate described as an “Institution.” It is a term which has

been overused and perhaps misused more than once, but I believe it is quite appropriately applied in observing that with Senator Trent Lott's departure, we have lost a reservoir of institutional knowledge, knowledge which has been of enormous value to Members of every political stripe for many years.

The breadth of Trent Lott's experience—on both sides of the aisle, in both Chambers of Congress, as back bencher, and as a member of leadership—has given him an insight into and understanding of the legislative process unique among his peers. We have heard many colleagues describe the effect of that experience when combined with the persuasive personality of the Mississippi gulf coast: No one counted votes better, and perhaps more important, no one enjoyed it more.

Within our caucus, in committee rooms, and on the floor, Trent could rely time and again on the great friendships and professional respect developed through years of hard work. Even more valuable perhaps, he understood the unusual psychology, decisionmaking, and ego unique to Members of Congress. We all perceive the important role these factors play in our work; few have been able to master them to their use.

For Trent, however, counting votes was only the means to a more important end—being an effective Senator. He has long been a strong voice for the State of Mississippi, but he has also developed the habit of finding his way to the center of the legislative storm at the crucial moment when a final deal is struck.

On matters of policy, I have worked both alongside and against Trent—even coming out ahead once or twice. Those rare events have revealed him to accept loss gracefully, negotiate in good faith, and accept compromise without conceding principle. These are traits essential to integrity and stability in governance, but also traits that strengthened his hand for the next battle.

Thus, the experience, the ability, the “institutional knowledge” we lose is very real. I count Senator Lott as more than a valued colleague; he is also a valued friend. As a Senator, in my first term, I have always been able to count on Trent for sound and thoughtful advice, which always reflected his sincere concern for the personal well-being, career, and family of all with whom he served. I always took confidence from the fact that he unabashedly placed family at the top of his priorities, and understood that our public service should not take place at our families' expense.

Mr. President, although I am the youngest Member of the U.S. Senate, and still serving in my first term, I am grateful to Senator Lott for his commitment to keeping the Senate strong. The Framers of our Constitution saw the Senate as the legislative body that would maintain an even keel, engage in meaningful debate, and forge legislation through the art of compromise