PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KEN LUCAS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2000

Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, because of unexpected storms, my airplane was delayed and I was unable to make the first two rollcall votes on Monday, July 10.

Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye'' on rollcall vote number 373 and ''nay'' on rollcall vote number 374.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN S. TANNER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2000

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, last night my plane, Northwest Flight #858, was delayed in Memphis and I missed Rollcall votes 373–378. If I had been present, I would have voted as follows: Coburn—Roll Call Vote 373—No; Royce—Roll Call Vote 374—No; Crowley—Roll Call Vote 375—Yes; Royce—Roll Call Vote 376—No; Coburn—Roll Call Vote 377—Yes; and Sanford—Roll Call Vote 378—No.

PERSONNAL EXPLANATION

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2000

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall no. 373, Coburn amendment—no; 374, Royce amendment—no; 375, Crowley amendment—yes; 376, Chabot amendment—no; 377, Coburn amendment—yes; and 378, Sanford amendment—no.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

SPEECH OF

HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 2000

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4461) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes:

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Brown-Waxman-Slaughter amendment. My generation remembers all too clearly the scourge of infectious diseases. When we were children, surviving to adolescence could be a major challenge. Children ran a gauntlet of potentially fatal diseases against which doctors had few, if any, effective weapons—influenza, pneumonia, measles, and tuberculosis, to name just a few. For some of us, we relived those fears again with our children. I know that with my three daughters, I breathed a sigh of relief when each summer ended and they had again escaped contracting polio.

With the discovery of antibiotics, the world of health and medicine was transformed. Antibiotics were nothing short of a miracle. Just a few doses could banish these terrifying diseases from our and our children's lives, allowing the nation to become dramatically healthier in the space of scarcely a decade. Modern medicine had triumphed over disease, relegating these terrors to the medical history books.

Or so we thought. Today we know differently. Infectious disease microorganisms have evolved over millennia, and they can be ingenious in ensuring their own survival. The advent of antibiotics dealt them a setback, but only a temporary one. After only a few decades these microbes are showing us just how quickly they can adapt and render themselves impervious to some or all of the antibiotics in our health care arsenal.

As a former microbiologist, I am keenly aware of the critical challenge posed by antimicrobial resistance. In fact, I wrote my master's thesis on the misuse of penicillin. Many factors are currently contributing to antimicrobial resistance: overprescription of antibiotics, individuals' failure to take all their medication, lack of handwashing and proper hygiene, and the increased ability of people—and therefore microbes—to travel around the globe quickly. Just as this problem is multi-faceted, so must any solution be.

This amendment seeks to address one critical component of that problem: the use of antibiotics to boost livestock growth and production. Decades ago, farmers discovered that the use of antibiotics at very low levels caused animals to grow faster and bigger. The amount of antibiotics used were too low to have any value in killing off infections in the animals. Over time, the practice of feeding antibiotics to livestock at ''subtherapeutic'' levels has become a common tool in the agriculture industry.

Unfortunately, this practice appears to be having an insidious side effect. Preliminary studies indicate that the bacteria in livestock may be developing an immunity to certain antibiotics as they are consistently exposed to these drugs at low levels. As the old saying goes, that which does not kill them makes them stronger.

This amendment would shift a very modest amount of funds within the Food and Drug Administration budget to the FDA's Center for Veterinary Medicine. With this funding, the Center could move more quickly on its top priority, assessing and preventing the growth of antimicrobial resistance related to livestock husbandry practices.

We must take action if we expect antibiotics to continue being effective in treating human ailments. None of us want to return to a day when a bout of pneumonia could easily mean a death sentence for one's child or parent. I urge my colleagues to support the Brown-Waxman-Slaughter amendment.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. WILLIAM L. JENKINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2000

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, as a result of inclement weather delaying my arrival to Washington, I was not present for rollcall votes 373, 374, and 375. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye'' on No. 373, ''no'' on No. 374, and ''aye'' on No. 375.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. VITO FOSSELLA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2000

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, I am not recorded on rollcall numbers 373, 375, 376, 377, and 378. I was unavoidably detained due to inclement weather, and therefore, was not present to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' on 373, ''yes'' on 375, ''no'' on 376, ''yes'' on 377, and ''no'' on 378.

IMF LOANS TO RUSSIA: WHAT HAVE THEY REALLY SUPPORTED?

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2000

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an op-ed article published in the ''Wall Street Journal Europe'' on June 8th by Mr. Boris Fedorov, a former Finance Minister in the government of the Russian Federation.

This article, entitled ''No More 'Help' for Russia, Please,'' paints a dismal picture of what has really been accomplished in Russia after the extension of more than $20 billion in low-cost loans to the Russian government by the International Monetary Fund. Average Russians have been disappointed and angered by what they see as the IMF's complicity in the vast corruption that has afflicted their country over the past decade. The Russian economy, propped up temporarily by a devaluation of the currency and the recent rise in oil prices, is marred by extensive poverty. Heathcare, education systems, highways deterioration.

What has happened to the $20 billion that the IMF has lent the Russian government over the past few years? Why has the Russian government failed, time and again, to meet its fiscal obligations to its own people, despite those IMF loans and the outright assistance provided to that government by the United States and other aid donors?

For one thing, the Russian government still insists on financing a ''superpower-sized army and bureaucracy'' that it cannot afford, as Mr. Fedorov states, and the rampant corruption in Russian government and industry is another important cause of the fiscal nightmare in that country. But Mr. Fedorov also points out the