house also was host for Kentucky's first Catholic seminary and the first nuns in the Sisters of Charity of Nazareth.

''I'm really in joy about today,'' said John Cissell, who traces his roots to early Catholic settlers here. His father was long active in the church and is buried in the cemetery on the church grounds.

''I just feel like I'm carrying on a tradition,'' he said.

Pohl, whose ancestors also include an early settler, said the parish is holding a reunion this summer of descendents of Maryland Catholics who settled in Kentucky in the early years.

Pope Benedict XVI will recognize the bicentennials of Louisville's and other historic dioceses at a Mass at Yankee Stadium in New York on April 20.

The archdiocese also plans a large celebration at Slugger Field in Louisville this summer.

SALUTE TO ''CORM & THE COACH''

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, it is my privilege today to salute Vermont radio personalities Steve Cormier and Tom Brennan, best known to Vermonters as the morning team ''Corm & the Coach'' on Champ 101.3.

Sixteen years ago, University of Vermont basketball coach Tom Brennan made a guest radio appearance on Steve Cormier's radio show. The two of them hit it off, not only as a duo, but with listeners. What started as a guest spot ended up becoming an extremely popular morning radio show for 16 years.

Recently, Coach Brennan decided to go out on top, as he did when he retired from the University of Vermont following three consecutive America East Conference championships. ''Corm & the Coach'' will air for the final time on Wednesday, July 2, 2008. Fortunately for Vermonters, Corm will remain on the air, continuing to keep us both entertained and informed, and Coach Brennan will continue to provide expert college basketball analysis on ESPN.

I have had the good fortune to appear on ''Corm & the Coach'' many times, and thought it important to take this opportunity to extend my appreciation to both of them. In honor of a great 16 years of ''Corm & the Coach,'' I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mike Donoghue of the Burlington Free Press, Corm To Carry On, Without The Coach, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Burlington Free Press, June 11, 2008]

CORM TO CARRY ON, WITHOUT THE COACH

(By Mike Donoghue)

''Corm and the Coach,'' the popular morning drive-time radio show that helped thousands of Champlain Valley listeners wake up for almost 16 years, will sign off July 2.

Tom Brennan, who retired as the University of Vermont men's basketball coach in 2005, plans to leave local radio next month, he and co-host Steve Cormier said Tuesday.

''I'm just really tired. I just don't want to turn into a cranky old man,'' Brennan said.

''I tried to make things better for people,'' he said. ''I just knew it was time for me to pack it in. I'm very appreciative of the faithful listeners. It was really nice when you would hear from them that we had helped make their day,'' he said.

Cormier, who is also program director at WCPV–FM, will continue to do the morning show.

Cormier said more details will be released this morning on the ''Corm and the Coach'' show, which airs Monday through Friday from 5 to 9 a.m. on Champ 101.3 (WCPV–FM) in Colchester and 102.1 in Randolph. ''The Best of Corm and the Coach'' is part of the Saturday morning broadcasts.

Brennan will continue to work as an in-studio basketball analyst for ESPN, which he joined in 2005.

Cormier said Brennan's departure has nothing to do with the pending sale of the station by Clear Channel to Vox Communications this summer. The sale is expected to be completed by midsummer, Cormier said.

''He's just tired. Tom said if it was an afternoon show, it would be fine, but getting up at 4 a.m. is not,'' Cormier said. ''I got him 10 more years than I thought I would.''

''Corm and the Coach'' began with Brennan stopping by to do morning sports reports, but blossomed into one of the highest rated local shows through the years.

During the show, Brennan has enjoyed providing wake-up calls to bleary-eyed opposing coaches, members of the media and other newsmakers. He read his poetry about current events over the airwaves and is in demand as a public speaker and master of ceremonies. The show has supported a number of charities, including its own golf tournament.

Brennan coached the Catamounts for 19 years. The team won the America East championships and made NCAA tournament appearances in his final three seasons. The highlight of his career was UVM's upset of Syracuse in the 2005 NCAAs.

Cormier said the initial game plan is to continue the show with producer Carolyn ''Burkie'' Lloyd until the new owners take over, at which time discussions will be held. He said guest celebrities might be asked to co-host.

''All good things must come to an end,'' Cormier said.

PAYMENTS TO PHYSICIANS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I started looking at the financial relationships between physicians and drug companies several years ago. I first began this inquiry by examining payments to individuals who served on FDA's Advisory Boards. More recently, I began looking at payments from drug companies to professors at our nation's medical schools and more specifically at the payments from Astra Zeneca to a professor of psychiatry at the University of Cincinnati.

I then moved on to look at several psychiatrists at Harvard and Mass General Hospital. These physicians are some of the top psychiatrists in the country, and their research is some of the most important in the field. They have also taken millions of dollars from the drug companies and failed to report those payments accurately to Harvard and Mass General.

For instance, in 2000 the National Institutes of Health awarded one Harvard physician a grant to study atomoxetine in children. At that time, this physician disclosed that he received less than $10,000 in payments from Eli Lilly which makes Straterra, a brand name of atomoxetine. But Eli Lilly reported that it paid this same physician more than $14,000 for advisory services that year—a difference of at least $4,000.

I would now like to report what I have found out about another researcher—Dr. Alan Schatzberg at Stanford. In the late nineties, Dr. Schatzberg helped to start a company called Corcept Therapeutics—Dr. Schatzberg is a copatent owner on a drug developed by Corcept. That company applied to the Food and Drug Administration for approval to market Mifepristone for psychotic depression.

Dr. Schatzberg is a well-known psychiatrist and has received several grants from the National Institutes of Health to study Mifepristone. While Dr. Schatzberg has reported some of his income from Corcept Therapeutics to Stanford, he did not report a profit of $109,179 from the sale of 15,597 shares of Corcept stock on August 15, 2005 because he was not required to do that under Stanford's rules.

But if it is not required by Stanford, I submit to you that it should be. Why? Because in his Stanford disclosures, Dr. Schatzberg only had to report whether he had more than $100,000 of stock in Corcept Therapeutics. However, his filings with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission show that he has control of 2,738,749 shares of Corcept stock worth over $6 million.

In addition, in 2002 Dr. Schatzberg did not report any income from Johnson & Johnson, but the company reported to me that it paid Dr. Schatzberg $22,000 that year. And in 2004, Dr. Schatzberg reported receiving between $10,000–$50,000 from Eli Lilly. But Eli Lilly reported to me that they paid Dr. Schaztberg over $52,000 that year.

Before closing, I would like to say that Stanford has been very cooperative in this investigation, as have been many of the drug companies. I ask unanimous consent to have my letter to Stanford printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCE,
Washington, DC, June 23, 2008.

Dr. JOHN L. HENNESSY,
President, Stanford University, Office of the President, Stanford, CA

DEAR DR. HENNESSY: First, I would like to thank you again for working with me to lower student tuition at Stanford University (Stanford/University). It was a great leap forward in the effort to help students afford a quality education. Next, I would like to bring several other issues to your attention regarding Stanford, its conflict of interest policies, and a particular faculty member at your University.

As you know, the United States Senate Committee on Finance (Committee) has jurisdiction over the Medicare and Medicaid programs and, accordingly, a responsibility to the more than 80 million Americans who receive health care coverage under these programs. As Ranking Member of the Committee, I have a duty to protect the health of

Medicare and Medicaid beneficiaries and safeguard taxpayer dollars appropriated for these programs. The actions taken by thought leaders, like those at Stanford, often have a profound impact upon the decisions made by taxpayer funded programs like Medicare and Medicaid and the way that patients are treated and taxpayer funds expended.

Moreover, and as has been detailed in several studies and news reports, funding by pharmaceutical companies can influence scientific studies, continuing medical education, and the prescribing patterns of doctors. Because I am concerned that there has been little transparency on this matter, I have sent letters to almost two dozen research universities across the United States regarding about 30 physicians. In these letters, I asked questions about the conflict of interest disclosure forms signed by some of their faculty. As you know universities like Stanford require doctors to report their related outside income. But I am concerned that these requirements are sometimes disregarded.

I have also been taking a keen interest in the almost $24 billion annually appropriated to the National Institutes of Health (NIH) to fund grants at various institutions such as Stanford. Institutions are required to manage a grantee's conflicts of interest. However, I am learning that this task is made difficult because physicians do not consistently report all the payments received from drug companies.

To bring some greater transparency to this issue, Senator KOHL and I introduced the Physician Payments Sunshine Act (Act). This Act will require drug companies to report publicly any payments that they make to doctors, within certain parameters.

I am also writing to assess the implementation of financial disclosure policies at Stanford University. In response to my letter of October 25, 2007, Stanford provided me with copies of the financial disclosure reports that Dr. Alan Schatzberg filed during the period of January 2000 through June 2007.

My staff investigators carefully reviewed each of Dr. Schatzberg's disclosure forms and detailed the payments disclosed. Subsequently, I asked that Stanford confirm the accuracy of the information. In March 2008, Stanford's Vice Provost and Dean of Research provided clarifications and additional information from Dr. Schatzberg pursuant to my inquiry.

In addition to obtaining information from Stanford, I also contacted executives at several major pharmaceutical and device companies and asked them to list the payments that they made to Dr. Schatzberg during the years 2000 through 2007. These companies voluntarily and cooperatively reported additional payments that do not appear to have been disclosed to Stanford by Dr. Schatzberg. For instance, in 2002 Dr. Schatzberg did not report any income from Johnson & Johnson, but the company reported to me that it paid Dr. Schatzberg $22,000 that year. And in 2004, Dr. Schatzberg reported receiving between $10,000–$50,000 from Eli Lilly. But Eli Lilly reported to me that they paid Dr. Schatzberg over $52,000 that year.

Because these disclosures do not match, I am attaching a chart intended to provide to Stanford a few examples of the data reported to me. This chart contains columns showing the payments disclosed in the forms Dr. Schatzberg filed with Stanford and the amounts reported by several drug and device companies.

The lack of consistency between what Dr. Schatzberg reported to Stanford and what several drug companies reported to me seems to follow a pattern of behavior. More specifically, I have uncovered inconsistent reporting patterns at the University of Cincinnati, and at Harvard University and Mass General Hospital.

INSTITUTIONAL AND NIH POLICIES

Let me now turn to another matter that is of concern. Stanford requires every faculty member to make an annual disclosure related to both conflict of commitment (where no financial information is requested), and conflict of interest. As noted to me in your letter dated March 14, 2008, ''It is our obligation to avoid bias in research, including that conducted with federal funds.''

Based upon the information provided to me to date, Stanford has a zero dollar threshold for disclosures for research involving human subjects. Faculty members are required to disclose a range of amounts received from outside relationships that are related to a faculty member's research activities (such as participation on advisory boards or boards of directors, or consulting). In most instances, the University's standard for a significant financial interest is whether the faculty member received $10,000 or more in income, holds $10,000 or more in equity for publicly traded companies, or has any equity in the company in the event the company is privately held.

Further, federal regulations place several requirements on a university/hospital when its researchers apply for NIH grants. These regulations are intended to ensure a level of objectivity in publicly funded research, and state in pertinent part that NIH investigators must disclose to their institution any ''significant financial interest'' may appear to affect the results of a study. NIH interprets ''significant financial interest'' to mean at least $10,000 in value or 5 percent ownership in a single entity.

Again based upon the information provided to me, it appears that Stanford takes failures to report outside income quite seriously. As noted in your correspondence dated March 14, 2008, ''It is our obligation to avoid bias in research, including that conducted with federal funds.'' You then described a Stanford investigation conducted in 2006 regarding a researcher who failed to report gifts, meals and trips from a device company. That faculty member was later terminated.

Based upon information available to me, it appears that Dr. Schatzberg received numerous NIH grants to conduct studies involving Mifepristone for treating depression. Corcept Therapeutics, a publicly traded company, has applied to the Food and Drug Administration for approval to market Mifepristone for psychotic depression. These grants funded studies during the years 2000 through 2007 that examined the treatment of psychotic major depression using Mifepristone. During these years, Dr. Schatzberg, consistent with Stanford's conflict policy, disclosed to Stanford a financial relationship with Corcept Therapeutics (Corcept) including stock ownership of over $100,000 and payments for activities including its Board of Directors, Advisory Board Membership, consulting, licensing agreements, and royalties. According to his disclosures, these payments were between $50,000 to $100,000 in the years 2003 through 2005, and between $10,000 to $50,000 in the years 2001, 2002, 2006, and 2007.

However, it appears based upon the information available, Dr. Schatzberg did not and was not required to report a profit of $109,179 from the sale of 15,597 shares of Corcept stock on August 15, 2005. This transaction is found in his publicly available filings with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC). Earlier that year, Dr. Schatzberg began enrolling an estimated 100 patients for a clinical trial, sponsored by the NIH, to evaluate Mifepristone to treat psychotic depression.

Further, while Dr. Schatzberg appropriately disclosed to Stanford that his stock shares were valued at over $100,000, I am not certain that this number captures the stocks' true value. Dr. Schatzberg carries an equity interest in Corcept with over 2 million shares of stock. For instance, as of January 31, 2008, he reported to the SEC that he held 2,438,749 shares of Corcept stock, with sole voting power for 2,738,749 shares. On June 12, 2008, Corcept stock closed at $2.24 a share, meaning that his stock is potentially worth over $6 million. Obviously, $6 million is a dramatically higher number than $100,000 and I am concerned that Stanford may not have been able to adequately monitor the degree of Dr. Schatzberg's conflicts of interest with its current disclosure policies and submit to you that these policies should be re-examined.

In light of the information set forth above, I ask your continued cooperation in examining conflicts of interest. In my opinion, institutions across the United States must be able to rely on the representations of its faculty to ensure the integrity of medicine, academia, and the grant-making process. And the NIH must rely on strong institutional conflict of interest policies to ensure the integrity of the grant making process. At the same time, should the Physician Payments Sunshine Act become law, institutions like yours will be able to access a database that will set forth the payments made to all doctors, including your faculty members.

Accordingly, I request that Stanford respond to the following questions and requests for information. For each response, please repeat the enumerated request and follow with the appropriate answer.

1. For each of the NIH grants received by Dr. Schatzberg, please confirm that he reported to Stanford University's designated official ''the existence of [a] conflicting interest.'' Please provide separate responses for each grant received for the period from January 1, 2000 to the present, and provide any supporting documentation for each grant identified.

2. For each grant identified above, please explain how Stanford ensured ''that the interest has been managed, reduced, or eliminated.'' Please provide an individual response for each grant that Dr. Schatzberg received from January 2000 to the present, and provide any documentation supporting each claim.

3. Did Dr. Schatzberg violate any federal or Stanford policies by not revealing his stock sale in 2005? If not, why not?

4. Is Stanford considering any changes in its disclosure policies to more fully capture the degree of a conflict when a faculty member owns shares in a company that are in excess of $100,000?

5. Please report on the status of any possible reviews of research misconduct and/or discrepancies in disclosures by Dr. Schatzberg, including what action if any will be considered.

6. Please report if a determination can be made as to whether or not Dr. Schatzberg violated guidelines governing clinical trials and the need to report conflicts of interest to an institutional review board (IRB). Please respond by naming each clinical trial for which the doctor was the principal investigator, along with confirmation that conflicts of interest were reported, if possible.

7. Please provide a total dollar figure for all NIH monies received annually by Stanford University. This request covers the period of 2000 through 2007.

8. Please provide a list of all NIH grants received by Stanford University. This request covers the period of 2000 through 2007. For each grant please provide the following:

a. Primary Investigator;

b. Grant Title;
c. Grant number;
d. Brief description; and
e. Amount of Award.

Thank you again for your continued cooperation and assistance in this matter. As you know, in cooperating with the Committee's review, no documents, records, data or information related to these matters shall be destroyed, modified, removed or otherwise made inaccessible to the Committee.

I look forward to hearing from you by no later than July xx, 2008. All documents responsive to this request should be sent electronically in PDF format to Brian_Downey@finance-rep.senate.gov. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Paul Thacker at (202) 224–4515.

Sincerely,

CHARLES E. GRASSLEY,
Ranking Member.

SELECTED DISCLOSURES BY DR. SCHATZBERG AND RELATED INFORMATION REPORTED BY PHARMACEUTICAL COMPANIES AND DEVICE MANUFACTURERS

Year	Company	Disclosure filed with Institution	Amount company reported
2000	Bristol Myers Squibb	No amount provided	$1,000
	Eli Lilly	No amount provided	$10,070
2001	Bristol Myers Squibb	No amount provided	$4,147
	Corcept Therapeutics	>$10,000<$50,000 [a]	n/a
	Eli Lilly	No amount provided	$10,788
2002	Bristol-Myers Squibb	Not reported	$2,134
	Corcept Therapeutics	>$100,000 [b]	n/a
	Corcept Therapeutics	<$10,000 [c]	n/a
	Corcept Therapeutics	<$10,000 [d]	n/a
	Eli Lilly	No amount provided	$19,788
	Johnson & Johnson	Not reported	$22,000
2003	Bristol-Myers Squibb	No amount provided	$4,000
	Corcept Therapeutics	<$10,000 [e]	n/a
	Corcept Therapeutics	>$10,000<$50,000 [f]	n/a
	Corcept Therapeutics	>$100,000 [g]	n/a
	Corcept Therapeutics	<$10,000 [h]	nfa
	Corcept Therapeutics	<$10,000 [i]	n/a
	Eli Lilly	No amount provided [j]	$18,157.34
2004	Bristol-Myers Squibb	<$10,000	$0.00
	Corcept Therapeutics	>$10,000<$50,000 [a]	n/a
	Corcept Therapeutics	>$100,000 [g]	n/a
	Eli Lilly	>$10,000<$50,000 [k]	$52,134
	Pfizer	Not reported	$2,500
2005	Bristol-Myers Squibb	<$10,000	$0
	Corcept Therapeutics	>$10,000<$50,000 [a]	n/a
	Corcept Therapeutics	>$100,000 [g]	na
	Eli Lilly	>$10,000-<$50,000	$9,500
	Pfizer	No amount provided	$2,000
2006	Bristol-Myers Squibb	Not reported	[l] $6,000
	Corcept Therapeutics	<$10,000 [h]	n/a
	Corcept Therapeutics	>$10,000<$50,000	n/a
	Corcept Therapeutics	>$100,000 [g]	n/a
	Eli Lilly	>$10,000<$50,000 [m]	$20,500
	Pfizer	Not reported	$300
2007	Eli Lilly	Not reported	$10,063

[a] Physician disclosed payment for Advisory Board Membership, Board of Directors, and consulting.
[b] Physician disclosed payment for equity.
[c] Physician disclosed payment for serving as a Director, consultant.
[d] Physician disclosed payment for royalties.
[e] Physician disclosed payment for serving as a Advisory Board Member.
[f] Physician disclosed payment for consulting.
[g] Physician disclosed stock ownership.
[h] Physician disclosed payment for licensing agreement.
[i] Physician disclosed payment for serving as Director, Board of Directors.
[j] Physician disclosed payment of <$10,000 for consulting, and did not provide amounts received for research, grants and gift funding.
[k] Physician disclosed payment of <$10,000 for Advisory Board Membership, and >$10,000<$50,000 for honoraria for papers or lectures, and consulting.
[l] Bristol-Myers Squibb stated that Stanford intended to pay Dr. Schatzberg $6,000 for conducting an annual course for which the company provides a grant.
[m] Physician disclosed payment for serving as a Advisory Board Member and consulting.

Note 1: When a Physician named a company in a disclosure but did not provide an amount, the text reads ''no amount reported.'' When a Physician did not list the company in the disclosure, the column reads ''not reported.'' The Committee contacted several companies for payment information and the notation nla (not available) reflects that a company was not contacted.

Note 2: The Committee was not able to estimate the total amount of payments disclosed by Dr. Schatzberg during the period January 2000 through June 2007 due to the fact that some amounts were not provided and in other instances ranges were used. Information reported by the pharmaceutical companies indicate that they made additional payments that are not reflected in his disclosures.

IDAHOANS SPEAK OUT ON HIGH ENERGY PRICES

Mr. CRAPO. Madam President, earlier this week, I asked Idahoans to share with me how high energy prices are affecting their lives, and they responded by the hundreds. The stories, numbering over 1,000, are heartbreaking and touching. To respect their efforts, I am submitting every e-mail sent to me through energy_prices@crapo.senate.gov to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This is not an issue that will be easily resolved, but it is one that deserves immediate and serious attention, and Idahoans deserve to be heard. Their stories not only detail their struggles to meet everyday expenses, but also have suggestions and recommendations as to what Congress can do now to tackle this problem and find solutions that last beyond today. I ask unanimous consent to have today's letters printed in the RECORD.

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

MIKE, Thanks for the invitation to vent. Well, that is not what you asked, but here goes. I'm one of those poor widows living on Social Security supplemented by a little bit of freelance writing, and energy costs are increasingly adding to sleepless nights as I worry about how to keep going. Do not cue the violins.

I agree with your points on increasing our energy independence, and believe that we are indeed stewards of the earth who will be held accountable by our Creator for how we manage it. I contend that these two points are not mutually exclusive, and who better than the great people of the United States to figure out how to do it.

I'm also interested in understanding how futures markets play into the increased cost of gasoline—anything you can tell me about that? Further, how about drastic changes to the red tape required to get nuclear plants up and running?

One last thing: If you have any influence with Senator John McCain, please use it to encourage him to come up with an aggressive energy policy post haste and present it to the voters. If ever there were a time, this is it, and he needs all the help he can get from those of us who are supporting him out of common-sense duty rather than devotion. Help, help.

Thanks for your ear and I hope this gets to you and not only your staff.

KATHY.

Mike, My family and I are making choices to limit our expenses as is rational, but we have means and discretionary income to juggle. My wife who is a public school administrator tells a different story regarding some of the pupils she sees right now in her summer school programs. They are showing up to school without breakfast, without a lunch, and no money to even buy snacks. Her schools have not offered free and reduced meals for summer school in the past (did not need to), but are trying desperately to do so now. Their parents, many of whom are working lower-paid jobs, are making very hard choices.

Think of the lowest paid tier of workers in our economy. They may not live in comfortable neighborhoods close to their work. Often they drive cars that are affordable up front, but get deplorable gas mileage thereafter. Forget insurance of any kind. In an economy like ours where housing starts and services are down, many of these fathers are working less hours and driving further away to get them. The choices are becoming untenable.

I realize that some of the hesitation to address energy in America is part social engineering (which in my opinion is the realm of the passive-aggressive and grossly irresponsible), and part is Washington's age-old reluctance to govern proactively rendering it ineffectual in matters that matter. But, many of your constituents cannot coast through this crisis until it sorts itself out. Worse, the inaction of your colleagues gives