that Mary Nell began what would become a lifetime commitment to volunteerism. Her unwavering support for fellow Americans is reflected in her activities that included volunteering her time at recruiting stations and at Cardinal Spellman's Foundling Home in New York.

At the end of World War II, she moved to New York City, where she defied the limits that hindered the progress of women in the workforce. By rising to positions of authority and respect in prominent companies such as American Cynamid and Alexander's Department Store, Mary Nell served as an inspiration to countless women who made the decision to pursue a professional career.

Upon her return to Missouri, Mary Nell continued her pursuit of knowledge and graduated from the University of Missouri-Columbia with a degree in Business Administration. Since that time, she has focused her efforts on a passion for music and joined the Women's Symphony League, Friends of Music of the University of Missouri, the University of Missouri's Arts & Sciences Alum Association Board and later served on the Missouri Symphony Society Board of Directors.

Mary Nell's time, energy and generous spirit have been invaluable to the Missouri Symphony Society as well as the Missouri Theatre. She has been critical in the creation of a thriving arts community in my hometown of Columbia. I am eternally grateful for her devotion to our community, and it is my pleasure to share Mary Nell Porter's accomplishment and valuable contributions with my colleagues.

THE UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON AN OPEN SOCIETY WITH SECURITY ACT

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 2005

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today, I reintroduce the United States Commission on an Open Society and Security Act, expressing an idea I began working on when the first signs of the closing of parts of our open society appeared after the Oklahoma City bombing tragedy, well before 9/11. This bill has grown more urgent as increasing varieties of security throughout the country have proliferated without any thought about their effect on common freedoms and ordinary access. The bill I introduce today would begin a systematic investigation that takes full account of the importance of maintaining our democratic traditions while responding adequately to the real and substantial threats terrorism poses.

To be useful in accomplishing its difficult mission, the commission would be composed not only of military and security experts, but for the first time, they would be at the same table with experts from such fields as business, architecture, technology, law, city planning, art, engineering, philosophy, history, sociology, and psychology. To date, questions of security most often have been left almost exclusively to security and military experts. They are indispensable participants, but these experts cannot alone resolve all the new and unprecedented issues raised by terrorism in an open society. In order to strike the balance required by our democratic traditions, a cross cutting group needs to be working together at the same table.

For years now before our eyes, parts of our open society have gradually been closed down because of terrorism and fear of terrorism—whether checkpoints at the Capital even when there are no alerts or applications of technology without regard to their effects on privacy. However, particularly following the unprecedented terrorist attack on our country, Americans have a right to expect additional and increased security adequate to protect citizens against this new frightening threat. People expect government to be committed and smart enough to undertake this awesome new responsibility without depriving them of their personal liberty. These years in our history will long be remembered by the rise of terrorism in the world and in this country. As a result, American society faces new and unprecedented challenges. We must provide ever-higher levels of security for our people and public spaces while maintaining a free and open democratic society. As yet, our country has no systematic process or strategy for meeting these challenges.

When we have been faced with unprecedented and perplexing issues in the past, we have had the good sense to investigate them deeply and to move to resolve them. Examples include the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States (also known as the 9/11 Commission), the Commission on the Intelligence Capabilities of the United States Regarding Weapons of Mass Destruction (also known as the Silberman Robb Commission) and the Kerner Commission following riotous uprisings that swept American cities in the 1960's and 1970's.

The important difference in the Commission proposed by this bill is that it seeks to act before a crisis in basic freedoms gradually takes hold and becomes entrenched. Because global terrorism is likely to be long lasting, we can not afford to allow the proliferation of security that most often requires no advance civilian oversight or analysis of alternatives and repercussions on freedom and commerce.

With only existing tools and thinking, we have been left to muddle through, using blunt 19th century approaches, such as crude blockades and other denials of access, or risking the right to privacy using applications of the latest technology with little attention to privacy. The threat of terrorism to our democratic society is too serious to be left to ad hoc problem-solving. Such approaches are often as inadequate as they are menacing.

We can do better, but only if we recognize and then come to grips with the complexities associated with maintaining a society of free and open access in a world characterized by unprecedented terrorism. The place to begin is with a high-level presidential commission of wise men and women expert in a broad spectrum of disciplines who can help chart the new course that will be required to protect both our people and our precious democratic institutions and traditions.

THE SAFETY OF SILICONE BREAST IMPLANTS

HON. CHARLIE NORWOOD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 2005

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, in addition to my remarks today, I am also submitting a letter written by Dr. Scott Spear to the Senate Health Education Labor and Pensions Committee and the House Energy and Commerce Committee. In it, Dr. Spear, who is the President of the American Society of Plastic Surgeons, brings to light an important health issue that the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) is currently debating: the safety of silicone gel-filled breast implants. The FDA's General and Plastic Surgery Devices Panel has scheduled an upcoming hearing that will focus primarily on the safety of these products for the American consumer. The information that Dr. Spear shares in his letter is important for us to take note of as this panel continues its work to make an informed, science-based decision on the safety of these implants. In addition, I am submitting for the RECORD a pamphlet entitled Safety of Silicone Breast Implants that reviews the long term studies that have been performed on silicone gel-filled breast implants. Taken along with Dr. Spear's letter, this brochure makes a compelling argument that in determining the very real and unquestionably important issue of determining the safety of these implants, we must set preconceived notions aside, and ensure that science dictates our actions. I urge my colleagues to review these two documents and I encourage you to join me in supporting the unbiased and open-minded work of the FDA panel as it determines the safety of silicone gel-filled breast implants for American consumers.

MARCH 4, 2005.

U.S. Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, U.S. House Energy and Commerce Committee, (Members and Health Legislative Assistants).

DEAR SENATORS: The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) is conducting an ongoing regulatory process regarding breast implants, which the American Society of Plastic Surgeons (ASPS) fully supports. As physicians and patient advocates, we support sound science and have confidence that the FDA will review valid scientific data and make its decisions based on the best interests of patients. Moreover, we believe a strong post-market surveillance process will serve the best interests of our patients.

As part of this process, the FDA's General and Plastic Surgery Devices Panel will be conducting hearings on April 11–13 regarding the pre-market approval (PMA) applications of two manufacturers' silicone gel-filled breast implants. The FDA appointed panel represents areas of expertise and judgment relevant to the product under review including academicians in specific fields, such as from radiology, oncology, biostatistics, ethics, plastic surgery, general surgery and other disciplines. Each panelist is vigorously screened and cleared by the FDA in advance of their participation. Historically, panelists have been permitted to engage in educational activities promoting patient care. These activities have not been deemed conflicts of interest. Anti-breast implant advocates continue to raise this issue to discredit qualified and reputable clinicians.

As a matter of background, the FDA's General and Plastic Surgery Devices Panel conducted a similar hearing in October 2003. The