CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008—S. CON. RES. 21, FURTHER REVISIONS TO THE CONFERENCE AGREEMENT PURSUANT TO SECTION 308(a) DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR ENERGY LEGISLATION

[In millions of dollars]

Current Allocation to Senate Environment and Public Works Committee:	
FY 2007 Budget Authority	42,426
FY 2007 Outlays	1,687
FY 2008 Budget Authority	43,535
FY 2008 Outlays	1,753
FY 2008–2012 Budget Authority	181,487
FY 2008–2012 Outlays	9,668
Adjustments:	
FY 2007 Budget Authority	0
FY 2007 Outlays	0
FY 2008 Budget Authority	0
FY 2008 Outlays	0
FY 2008–2012 Budget Authority	134,696
FY 2008–2012 Outlays	114,402
Revised Allocation to Senate Environment and Public Works Committee:	
FY 2007 Budget Authority	42,426
FY 2007 Outlays	1,687
FY 2008 Budget Authority	43,535
FY 2008 Outlays	1,753
FY 2008–2012 Budget Authority	316,183
FY 2008–2012 Outlays	124,070

REMEMBERING JOHN W. KEYS, III

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise today on a sad note—to inform the Senate of the recent death of a model public servant who served our country well. John W. Keys, III, was the 16th Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation. He served in that capacity from July 17, 2001, to April 15, 2006, and worked closely with the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources which I have the privilege of chairing. Commissioner Keys retired 2 years ago to return to Utah and pursue his favorite pastimes which included flying. Tragically, he was killed on May 30, 2008, when the airplane he was piloting crashed in Canyonlands National Park, UT, with one passenger aboard.

Commissioner Keys' appointment by President Bush to lead the Bureau of Reclamation was actually his second stint with the agency. He returned to Federal service after previously retiring from a 34-year career with reclamation. During that time, he worked as a civil and hydraulic engineer in various positions throughout the western United States. Ultimately, he served as reclamation's Pacific Northwest regional director for 12 years before his initial retirement in 1998.

Commissioner Keys was a dedicated public servant whose knowledge, experience, and demeanor were key factors in his successful leadership of the Bureau of Reclamation. Those same skills, combined with his willingness to work with Congress on a bipartisan basis, were instrumental in addressing a wide range of water resource issues across the West. He will be sorely missed, but left a legacy of accomplishments that will ensure that he is long-remembered. I offer my condolences to his wife, Dell, and their daughters, Cathy and Robyn.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the memory of John W. Keys, III, who died tragically in a plane crash on Friday, May 30, 2008. John was a long-time Federal official, and a kind and thoughtful man.

John Keys was born in Sheffield, AL. He earned a bachelor's degree in civil engineering from the Georgia Institute of Technology and a master's degree from Brigham Young University. John was dedicated to his community, and spent much of his spare time serving as a search-and-rescue pilot for Utah County and as a college and high school football referee.

The majority of John Keys' life, however, was centered on his marriage to his wife Dell and his professional career at the Bureau of Reclamation, an agency of the Department of the Interior. John spent nearly 40 years working with Reclamation. From 1964 to 1979, he worked as a civil and hydraulic engineer in the Great Basin, Missouri River Basin, Colorado River Basin, and Columbia River Basin. I first met John when he served as Reclamation's Pacific Northwest regional director. In 1995, he was awarded Interior's highest honor—the Distinguished Service Award—for maintaining open lines of communication and keeping interest groups focused on solutions. After 12 years as Northwest regional director, John retired in 1998.

In 2001, John emerged from retirement to take a position as the 16th Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation. As Commissioner, John oversaw a venerable agency charged with the operation and maintenance of water storage, water distribution, and electric power generation facilities in 17 Western States. John placed great emphasis on operating and maintaining Reclamation projects to ensure continued delivery of water and power benefits to the public, consistent with environmental and other requirements. He was committed to honoring State water rights, interstate compacts, and contracts with Reclamation's users. This commitment helped the agency develop creative solutions to address the water resource challenges of the West.

John had retired as Commissioner in 2006. He was a highly respected and dedicated public servant. I stand today to express my appreciation for his service to the Northwest and to our country. I want to offer my sincere condolences to his wife, his daughters, and those he leaves behind.

PAYMENTS TO PHYSICIANS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, starting last year, I started looking at the financial relationships between physicians and drug companies. I first began this inquiry by examining payments from Astra Zeneca to Dr. Melissa DelBello, a professor of psychiatry at the University of Cincinnati.

In 2002, Dr. DelBello published a study that found that Seroquel worked for kids with bipolar disorder. The study was paid for by Astra Zeneca, and the following year that company paid Dr. DelBello around $100,000 for speaking fees and honoraria. In 2004, Astra Zeneca paid Dr. DelBello over $80,000.

Today, I would like to talk about three physicians at Harvard Medical School—Drs. Joseph Biederman, Thomas Spencer, and Timothy Wilens. They 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.

Out of concern about the relationship between this money and their research, I asked Harvard and Mass General Hospital last October to send me the conflict of interest forms that these doctors had submitted to their institutions. Universities often require faculty to fill these forms out so that we can know if the doctors have a conflict of interest.

The forms I received were from the year 2000 to the present. Basically, these forms were a mess. My staff had a hard time figuring out which companies the doctors were consulting for and how much money they were making. But by looking at them, anyone would be led to believe that these doctors were not taking much money. Over the last 7 years, it looked like they had taken a couple hundred thousand dollars.

But last March, Harvard and Mass General asked these doctors to take a second look at the money they had received from the drug companies. And this is when things got interesting. Dr. Biederman suddenly admitted to over $1.6 million dollars from the drug companies. And Dr. Spencer also admitted to over $1 million. Meanwhile, Dr. Wilens also reported over $1.6 million in payments from the drug companies.

The question you might ask is: Why weren't Harvard and Mass General watching over these doctors? The answer is simple: They trusted these physicians to honestly report this money.

Based on reports from just a handful of drug companies, we know that even these millions do not account for all of the money. In a few cases, the doctors disclosed more money than the drug companies reported. But in most cases, the doctors reported less money.

For instance, Eli Lilly has reported to me that they paid tens of thousands of dollars to Dr. Biederman that he still has not accounted for. And the same goes for Drs. Spencer and Wilens.

What makes all of this even more interesting is that Drs. Biederman and Wilens were awarded grants from the National Institutes of Health to study the drug Strattera.

Obviously, if a researcher is taking money from a drug company while also receiving Federal dollars to research that company's product, then there is a conflict of interest. That is why I am asking the National Institutes of Health to take a closer look at the grants they give to researchers. Every year, the NIH hands out almost $24 billion in grants. But nobody is watching

to ensure that the conflicts of interest are being monitored.

That is why Senator KOHL and I introduced the Physician Payments Sunshine Act. This bill will require companies to report payments that they make to doctors. As it stands right now, universities have to trust their faculty to report this money. And we can see that this trust is causing the universities to run afoul of NIH regulations. This is one reason why industry groups such as PhRMA and Advamed, as well as the American Association of Medical Colleges, have all endorsed my bill. Creating one national reporting system, rather than relying on a hodge-podge of state systems and some voluntary reporting systems, is the right thing to do.

Before closing, I would like to say that Harvard and Mass General have been extremely cooperative in this investigation, as have Eli Lilly, Astra Zeneca and other companies. I ask unanimous consent that my letters to Harvard, Mass General, and the NIH be printed 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 4, 2008.

ELIAS A. ZERHOUNI, M.D.
Director, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Maryland.

DEAR DIRECTOR ZERHOUNI: As a senior member of the United States Senate and the Ranking Member of the Committee on Finance (Committee), I have a duty under the Constitution to conduct oversight into the actions of executive branch agencies, including the activities of the National Institutes of Health (NIH/Agency). In this capacity, I must ensure that NIH properly fulfills its mission to advance the public's welfare and makes responsible use of the public funding provided for medical studies. This research often forms the basis for action taken by the Medicare and Medicaid programs.

Over the past number of years, I have become increasingly concerned about the lack of oversight regarding conflicts of interest relating to the almost $24 billion in annual extramural funds that are distributed by the NIH. In that regard, I would like to take this opportunity to notify you about five problems that have come to my attention on this matter.

First, it appears that three researchers failed to report in a timely, complete and accurate manner their outside income to Harvard University (Harvard) and Massachusetts General Hospital (MGH). By not reporting this income, it seems that they are placing Harvard and MGH in jeopardy of violating NIH regulations on conflicts of interest. I am attaching that letter for your review and consideration.

Second, I am requesting an update about a letter I sent you last October on problems with conflicts of interest and NIH extramural funding regarding Dr. Melissa DelBello at the University of Cincinnati (University). In that letter, I notified you that Dr. DelBello receives grants from the NIH, however, she was failing to report her outside income to her University.

Third, the Inspector General for the Department of Health and Human Services Office (HHS OIG) released a disturbing report last January which found that NIH provided almost no oversight of its extramural funds. But your staff seemed to show little interest in this report. In fact, Norka Ruiz Bravo, the NIH deputy director of extramural programs was quoted in The New York Times saying, ''For us to try to manage directly the conflict-of-interest of an NIH investigator would be not only inappropriate but pretty much impossible.''

Fourth, I am dismayed to have read of funding provided to several researchers from the Foundation for Lung Cancer: Early Detection, Prevention & Treatment (Foundation). Dr. Claudia Henschke and Dr. David Yankelevitz are two of the Foundation's board members. As reported by The New York Times, the Foundation was funded almost entirely with monies from tobacco companies, and this funding was never fully disclosed. Monies from the Foundation were then used to support a study that appeared in The New England Journal of Medicine (NEJM) back in 2006 regarding the use of computer tomography screening to detect lung cancer. The NEJM disclosure states that the study was supported also by NIH grants held by Drs. Henschke and Yankelevitz.

Regarding the lack of transparency by Dr. Henschke and Dr. Yankelevitz, National Cancer Institute Director John Niederhuber told the Cancer Letter, ''[W]e must always be transparent regarding any and all matters, real or perceived, which might call our scientific work into question.''

The NEJM later published a clarification regarding its earlier article and a correction revealing that Dr. Henschke also received royalties for methods to assess tumors with imaging technology. There is no evidence that the Foundation's tobacco money or Dr. Henschke's royalties influenced her research. But I am concerned that the funding source and royalties may have not been disclosed when the NIH decided to fund Dr. Henschke.

Fifth, I sent you a letter on April 15, outlining my concerns about a report on the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS). That report found 45 cases at the NIEHS where extramural grants had not receiving sufficient peer review scores but were still funded. This finding is yet another example that the NIH provides little oversight for its extramural program.

Dr. Zerhouni, you faced similar scandals back in 2003 when it came to light that many NIH intramural researchers enjoyed lucrative arrangements with pharmaceutical companies. It took you some time, but you eventually brought some transparency, reform and integrity back to NIH. As you told Congress during one hearing, ''I have reached the conclusion that drastic changes are needed as a result of an intensive review by NIH of our ethics program, which included internal fact-finding as well as an external review by the Blue Ribbon Panel.''

NIH oversight of the extramural program is lax and leaves people with nothing more than questions—$24 billion worth of questions, to be exact. I am interested in understanding how you will address this issue. American taxpayers deserve nothing less.

In the interim, I ask you to respond to the following requests for information and documents. In responding to each request, first repeat the enumerated question followed by the appropriate response. Your responses should encompass the period of January 1, 2000 to April 1, 2008. I would appreciate receiving responses to the following questions by no later than June 18, 2008:

1. Please explain what actions the NIH has or will initiate to provide better oversight and transparency for its extramural funding program.

2. Please explain how often the NIH has investigated and/or taken action regarding a physician's failure to report a ''significant financial interest,'' as defined by NIH regulation. For each investigation, please provide the following information:

a. Name of the Doctor(s) involved;

b. Date investigation began and the date ended;

c. Specific allegations which triggered investigation;

d. Findings of the investigation; and

e. Actions taken by the NIH, if any.

3. Since receiving notice that the University of Cincinnati was provided incomplete information from Dr. DelBello regarding her outside income, what steps has/will NIH take to address this issue? Please be specific.

4. Please provide a list of all NIH grants received by Dr. DelBello. For each grant, please provide the following:

a. Name of grant;

b. Topic of grant; and

c. Amount of funding for grant.

5. Please provide a list of any other interactions that Dr. DelBello has had with the NIH to include membership on advisory boards, peer review on grants, or the like.

6. Since reports appeared in the press regarding the undisclosed funding of the Foundation for Lung Cancer: Early Detection, Prevention & Treatment, what steps has/will NIH take to address this issue? Please provide all external and internal communications regarding this issue.

7. Please provide a list off all NIH grants received by Dr. Claudia Henschke. For each grant, please provide the following:

a. Name of grant;

b. Topic of grant; and

c. Amount of funding for grant.

8. Please provide a list of any other interactions that Dr. Henschke has had with the NIH to include membership on advisory boards, peer review on grants, or the like.

9. Please provide a list off all NIH grants received by Dr. David Yankelevitz. For each grant, please provide the following:

a. Name of grant;

b. Topic of grant; and

c. Amount of funding for grant.

10. Please provide a list of any other interactions that Dr. Yankelevitz has had with the NIH to include membership on advisory boards, peer review on grants, or the like.

11. Please provide a list off all NIH grants received by Dr. Joseph Biederman. For each grant, please provide the following:

a. Name of grant;

b. Topic of grant; and

c. Amount of funding for grant.

12. Please provide a list of any other interactions that Dr. Biederman has had with the NIH to include membership on advisory boards, peer review on grants, or the like.

13. Please provide a list off all NIH grants received by Dr. Timothy Wilens. For each grant, please provide the following:

a. Name of grant;

b. Topic of grant; and

c. Amount of funding for grant.

14. Please provide a list of any other interactions that Dr. Wilens has had with the NIH to include membership on advisory boards, peer review on grants, or the like.

I request your prompt attention to this matter and your continued cooperation. I also request that the response to this letter contain your personal signature. If you have any questions please contact my Committee staff, Paul Thacker at (202) 224–4515. Any formal correspondence should be sent electronically in PDF searchable format to brian—downey@finance-rep.senate.gov.

Sincerely,

CHARLES E. GRASSLEY,
Ranking Member.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCE,
Washington, DC, June 4, 2008.

Dr. DREW GILPIN FAUST,
President, Harvard University,
Massachusetts Hall, Cambridge, MA.
Dr. PETER L. SLAVIN,
President, Massachusetts General Hospital (Partners Healthcare), Boston, MA.

DEAR DRS. FAUST AND SLAVIN: 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 Harvard Medical School who are discussed throughout this letter, 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 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. In these letters, I asked questions about the conflict of interest disclosure forms signed by some of their faculty. Universities require doctors to report their related outside income, but I am concerned that these requirements are disregarded sometimes.

I have also been taking a keen interest in the almost $24 billion annually appropriated to the National Institutes of Health to fund grants at various institutions such as yours. As you know, institutions are required to manage a grantee's conflicts of interest. But 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 writing to try and assess the implementation of financial disclosure policies of Harvard University (Harvard) and Massachusetts General Hospital (MGH/Partners), (the Institutions). In response to my letters of June 29, October 25, and October 26, 2007, your Institutions provided me with the financial disclosure reports that Drs. Joseph Biederman, Thomas Spencer, and Timothy Wilens (Physicians) filed during the period of January 2000 through June 2007.

My staff investigators carefully reviewed each of the Physicians' disclosure forms and detailed the payments disclosed. I then asked that your Institutions confirm the accuracy of the information. In March 2008, your Institutions then requested additional information from the Physicians pursuant to my inquiry. That information was subsequently provided to me.

In their second disclosures to your Institutions, the Physicians revealed different information than they had disclosed initially to your respective Institutions. On April 29, 2008, I received notification from Harvard Medical School's Dean for Faculty and Research Integrity that he has referred the cases of these Physicians to the Standing Committee on Conflicts of Interest and Commitment (''Standing Committee''). The Chief Academic Officer (CAO), Partners HealthCare System, also wrote me that Partners will look to the Standing Committee to conduct the initial factual review of potential non-compliance that are contained in both the Harvard Medical School Policy and the Partners Policy. In addition, the CAO stated that, in addition to the Standing Committee's review process, Partners will conduct its own independent review of conflicts of interest disclosures these Physicians submitted separately to Partners in connection with publicly funded research and other aspects of Partners Policy. I look forward to being updated on these reviews in the near future.

In addition, I contacted executives at several major pharmaceutical companies and asked them to list the payments that they made to Drs. Biederman, Spencer, and Wilens during the years 2000 through 2007. These companies voluntarily and cooperatively reported additional payments that the Physicians do not appear to have disclosed to your Institutions.

Because these disclosures do not match, I am attaching a chart intended to provide a few examples of the data that have been reported me. This chart contains three columns: payments disclosed in the forms the physicians filed at your Institutions, payments revealed in March 2008, and amounts reported by some drug companies.

I would appreciate further information to see if the problems I have found with these three Physicians are systemic within your Institutions.

INSTITUTIONAL AND NIH POLICIES

Both Harvard and MGH/Partners have established an income de minimus limit. This policy forbids researchers working at your Institutions from conducting clinical trials with a drug or technology if they receive payments over $20,000 from the company that manufactures that drug or technology. Prior to 2004, the income de minimus limit established by your institutions was $10,000.

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'' that 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.

Based upon information available to me, it appears that each of the Physicians identified above received grants to conduct studies involving atomoxetine, a drug that sells under the brand name Strattera. For example:

In 2000, the NIH awarded Dr. Biederman a grant to study atomoxetine in children. At that time, Dr. Biederman disclosed that he received less than $10,000 in payments from Eli Lilly & Company (Eli Lilly). But Eli Lilly reported that it paid Dr. Biederman more than $14,000 for advisory services that year—a difference of at least $4,000.

In 2004, the NIH awarded Dr. Wilens a 5–year grant to study atomoxetine. In his second disclosure to your Institutions, Dr. Wilens revealed that he received $7,500 from Eli Lilly in 2004. But Eli Lilly reported to me that it paid Dr. Wilens $27,500 for advisory services and speaking fees in 2004—a difference of about $20,000.

It is my understanding that Dr. Wilens' NIH-funded study of atomoxetine is still ongoing. According to Eli Lilly, it paid Dr. Wilens almost $65,000 during the period January 2004 through June 2007. However, as of March 2008, and based upon the documents provided to us to date, Dr. Wilens disclosed payments of about half of the amount reported by Eli Lilly for this period. Dr. Wilens also did three other studies of atomoxetine in 2006 and 2007.

I have also found several instances where these Physicians apparently received income above your institutions' income de minimus limit. For instance, in 2003, Dr. Spencer conducted a study of atomoxetine in adolescents. At the time, he disclosed no significant financial interests related to this study. But Eli Lilly reported paying Dr. Spencer over $25,000 that year.

In 2001, Dr. Biederman disclosed plans to begin a study sponsored by Cephalon, Inc. At the time; Dr. Biederman disclosed that he had no financial relationship with the sponsor of this study. Yet, on his conflict of interest disclosure, he acknowledged receiving research support and speaking fees from Cephalon, Inc., but did not provide any information on the amounts paid. In March 2008, Dr. Biederman revealed that Cephalon, Inc. paid him $13,000 in 2001.

In 2005, Dr. Biederman began another clinical trial sponsored by Cephalon, Inc., which was scheduled to start in September 2005 and end in September 2006. Initially, Dr. Biederman disclosed that he had no financial relationship with the sponsor of this study. But in March 2008, Dr. Biederman revealed that Cephalon, Inc. paid him $11,000 for honoraria in 2005 and an additional $24,750 in 2006.

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. 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. Indeed at this time there are several pharmaceutical and device companies that are looking favorably upon the Physician Payments Sunshine Bill and for that I am gratified.

Accordingly, I request that your respective institutions 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 the Physicians, please confirm that the Physicians reported to Harvard and MGH/Partners' designated official ''the existence of [his] 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 Harvard and MGH/Partners ensured ''that the interest has been managed, reduced, or eliminated?'' Please provide an individual response for each grant that each doctor received from January 2000 to the present, and provide any documentation to support each claim.

3. Please report on the status of the Harvard Standing Committee and additional Partners reviews of the discrepancies in disclosures by Drs. Biederman, Spencer and Wilens, including what action, if any, will be considered.

4. For Drs. Biederman, Spencer, and Wilens, please report whether a determination can be made as to whether or not any doctor 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.

5. Please provide a total dollar figure for all NIH monies annually received by Harvard and MGH/Partners, respectively. This request covers the period of 2000 through 2007.

6. Please provide a list of all NIH grants received by Harvard and MGH/Partners. 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 June 18, 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. BIEDERMAN AND RELATED INFORMATION REPORTED BY PHARMACEUTICAL COMPANIES

Year	Company	Disclosure filed with institution	Payments revealed in March 2008	Amount company Reported
2000	GlaxoSmithKline	Not reported	$2,000	$3,328
	Eli Lilly & Company	<$10,000	3,500	14,105
	Pfizer Inc.	Not reported	7,000	7,000
2001	Cephalon	No amount provided	13,000	n/a
	GlaxoSmithKline	No amount provided	5,500	4,428
	Eli Lilly & Company	No amount provided	6,000	14,339
	Johnson & Johnson	Not reported	3,500	58,169
	Medical Education Systems	Not reported	21,000	n/a
	Pfizer Inc.	No amount provided	5,625	5,625
2002	Bristol-Myers Squibb	No amount provided	2,000	2,000
	Cephalon	No amount provided	3,000	n/a
	Colwood	Not reported	14,000	n/a
	Eli Lilly & Company	No amount provided	11,000	2,289
	Johnson & Johnson	Not reported	Not reported	706
	Pfizer Inc.	No amount provided	4,000	2,000
2003	Bristol-Myers Squibb	No amount provided	500	250
	Cephalon	<10,000	4,000	n/a
	Eli Lilly & Company	<10,000	8,250	18,347
	Johnson & Johnson	<10,000	2,000	2,889
	Medlearning	Not reported	26,500	n/a
	Pfizer Inc.	<10,000	1,000	1,000
2004	Bristol-Myers Squibb	No amount provided	6, 266	6,266
	Cephalon	Not reported	4,000	n/a
	Eli Lilly & Company	No amount provided	8,000	15,686
	Johnson & Johnson	Not reported	Not reported	902
	Medlearning	Not reported	26,000	n/a
	Pfizer Inc.	Not reported	3,000	4,000
2005	Cephalon	Not reported	11,000	n/a
	Eli Lilly & Company	<20,000	12,500	7,500
	Johnson & Johnson	Not reported	Not reported	962
	Pfizer Inc.	Not reported	3,000	3,000
	Medlearning	Not reported	34,000	n/a
2006	Cephalon	Not reported	24,750	n/a
	Johnson & Johnson	Not reported	Not reported	750
	Primedia	Not reported	56,000	n/a
2007	Primedia	Not reported	30,000	n/a

Note 1: Dr. Biederman revealed in March 2008 that his outside income totaled about $1.6 million during the period January 2000 through June 2007. Information reported by the pharmaceutical companies indicate that they made additional payments that are not reflected in Dr. Biederman's disclosures.

Note 2: 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 n/a (not available) reflects that a company was not contacted.

SELECTED DISCLOSURES BY DR. SPENCER AND RELATED INFORMATION REPORTED BY PHARMACEUTICAL COMPANIES

Year	Company	Disclosure filed with institution	Payments revealed in March 2008	Amount company reported
2000	GlaxoSmithKline	Not reported	$3,000	$1,500
	Eli Lilly & Company	Not reported	12,345	11,463
2001	GlaxoSmithKline	Not reported	4,000	1,000
	Eli Lilly & Company	Not reported	8,500	10,859
	Strategic Implications	Not reported	16,800	n/a
2002	GlaxoSmithKline	Not reported	3,000	3,369
	Eli Lilly & Company	Not reported	14,000	14,016
	Strategic Implications	Not reported	29,000	n/a
2003	Eli Lilly & Company	Not reported	6.000	25,500
	Johnson & Johnson	Not reported	1,250	0
	Thomson Physicians World	Not reported	46,500	n/a
2004	Eli Lilly & Company	Not reported	Not reported	23,000
	Pfizer Inc.	Not reported	3,500	3,500
2005	Eli Lilly & Company	<$20,000	6,000	7,500
	Johnson & Johnson	Not reported	1,500	227
	Medlearning	Not reported	28,250	n/a
2006	Eli Lilly & Company	No amount provided	15,688	8,188
	Johnson & Johnson	Not reported	5,500	0
	Primedia	Not reported	44,000	n/a
2007	Eli Lilly & Company	No amount provided	6,000	16,188

Note 1: Dr. Spencer revealed in March 2008 that his outside income totaled about $1 million during the period January 2000 through June 2007. Information reported by the pharmaceutical companies indicate that they made additional payments that are not reflected in Dr. Spencer's disclosures.

Note 2: 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 n/a (not available) reflects that a company was not contacted.

SELECTED DISCLOSURES BY DR. WILENS AND RELATED INFORMATION REPORTED BY PHARMACEUTICAL COMPANIES

Year	Company	Disclosure filed with institution	Payments revealed in March 2008	Amount company reported
2000	GlaxoSmithKline	Not reported	$5,250	$12,009
	Eli Lilly & Company	Not reported	2,000	2,057
	Pfizer Inc.	Not reported	1,250	2,250
	TVG	Not reported	11,000	n/a
2001	GlaxoSmithKline	<$10,000	n/a	2,269
	Eli Lilly & Company	No amount provided	3,952	952
	J.B. Ashtin	Not reported	14,500	n/a
2002	GlaxoSmithKline	Not reported	7,500	10,764
	Eli Lilly & Company	Not reported	4,500	3,000
	Pfizer Inc.	Not reported	1,500	1,500
	Phase 5	Not reported	20,000	n/a

SELECTED DISCLOSURES BY DR. WILENS AND RELATED INFORMATION REPORTED BY PHARMACEUTICAL COMPANIES—Continued

Year	Company	Disclosure filed with institution	Payments revealed in March 2008	Amount company reported
2003	Eli Lilly & Company	Not reported	12,000	0
	Phase 5	Not reported	90,500	n/a
	TVG	Not reported	31,000	n/a
	Medlearning	Not reported	24,000	n/a
2004	Eli Lilly & Company	Not reported	7,500	27,500
	Phase 5	Not reported	84,250	n/a
	Medlearning	Not reported	46,000	n/a
2005	Eli Lilly & Company	<20,000	9,500	9,500
	Promedix	Not reported	70,000	n/a
	Advanced Health Media	Not reported	37,750	n/a
2006	Eli Lilly and Physician World (Lilly)	No amount provided	5,963	12,798
	Advanced Health Media	Not reported	56,000	n/a
	Primedia	Not reported	32,000	n/a
2007	Eli Lilly & Company	Not reported	9,000	14,969
	Veritas	Not reported	25,388	n/a

Note 1: Dr. Wilens revealed in March 2008 that his outside income totaled about $1.6 million during the period January 2000 through June 2007. Information reported by the pharmaceutical companies indicate that they made additional payments that are not reflected in Dr. Spencer's disclosures.

Note 2: 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 n/a (not available) reflects that a company was not contacted.

MINNESOTA'S 150TH BIRTHDAY

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, in May, I joined Governor Pawlenty, Senator COLEMAN and our Minnesota Congressional Delegation, our State legislators and thousands of Minnesotans in celebrating Minnesota's 150 years as a State.

We are proud to be a State where—in the words of our unofficial poet laureate Garrison Keillor—all the women are strong, all the men are good-looking, and all the sesquicentennials are above average.

For 150 years, our State has been built by people who knew they had to work hard, had to be bold, and had to persevere—to overcome the adversities and hardships that confronted them.

Each one of us here is a part of Minnesota's illustrious history. And each one of us has our own story about our Minnesota heritage.

Mine has its roots in the rough and tumble Iron Range, where my grandpa worked 1,500 feet underground in the mines of Ely. He and my grandma graduated from high school, but they saved money in a coffee can to send my dad to college. The little house they lived in all their lives they got when the mine closed down in Babbitt. They loaded it on the back of a flatbed truck and dynamited out a hole for the basement in Ely. The only problem was my grandpa used too much dynamite and the neighbor's wash went down a block away from all the flying rocks.

I told the story up north a while back and some old guy stood up and yelled out, ''As if we don't remember!'' They have long memories up on the Range.

Today is a day to remember that Minnesota is recognized and admired both for our natural beauty and our hard-working people.

We are home to the headwaters of the Mississippi River and to Lake Superior, the ''greatest'' of the Great Lakes.

We are home to native peoples whose history stretches far before our statehood.

We are the State that mined the iron ore for America's ships and skyscrapers.

We are the home to Fortune 500 companies that lead the way in innovation—bringing the world everything from the pacemaker to the Post-It Note.

We are home to hospitals and medical institutions that heal the sick from around the world.

And we are now a national leader in the renewable energy that will power our future.

For 150 years, we have served our country with great honor. Back in the Civil War, it was the First Minnesota that held the line during the Battle of Gettysburg, preventing a breach in the Union lines. The price this volunteer unit paid was the highest casualty rate of any military unit in American history, and today their flag flies here in the Capitol rotunda as a reminder of their bravery and sacrifice.

Now, the Minnesota National Guard's 34th Infantry Regiment—the famed Red Bulls—traces its roots to the 1st Minnesota Volunteers and they continue to honor that tradition of service to country.

On the sports field, we are home to the 1987 and 1991 World Series Champion Minnesota Twins.

It was a Minnesotan, Herb Brooks, who coached the U.S. Hockey Team to the gold medal in the 1980 Winter Olympics—the ''Miracle on Ice.''

Of course, after years of anguish, my dad, still an avid sports fan, continues to ask if the Vikings will ever win the Super Bowl.

We brought the world music legends from Bob Dylan to Prince to ''Whoopie John,'' the King of Polka from New Ulm.

And speaking of culture, Darwin, MN, is home to the world's largest ball of twine built by one person (my husband made me add the ''by one person!''). He saw a documentary about some other ball of twine.

Then we have our many colorful politicians, from Senator James Shields, who challenged Abraham Lincoln to a saber duel, to Senator Magnus Johnson, whose Swedish accent was so thick that his nickname going into the Senate was ''Yenerally Speaking Yohnson'', to Governor Rudy Perpich and his polka-mass; to Governor Ventura and his feather boa, to Paul Wellstone and his green bus, to two of America's most beloved Vice Presidents.

In fact, I read in a national magazine way back that ours is the only State where parents bounce their babies on their knees and say, ''One day you could grow up to be Vice President.''

But, Minnesota's celebration is not just about our history. It is also about our future. That is why the involvement of young people is so important—especially our young essay winners.

I always think of our State as a ''work in progress.''

We are a State whose people have always believed—despite the cold, the snow, the windswept prairies . . . Despite all that, we have always believed that anything was possible.

We are a State that is defined by the optimism of our people. We look to the future and we believe that—with hard work, education and good values—we can make tomorrow better than today.

I am reminded of an Ojibwe prayer passed down from the ages—the prayer that our leaders and our people make decisions not for their own generation but for those seven generations from now.

That is what that ragtag brigade of Minnesota citizen soldiers did in 1863 when they held the line at the Battle of Gettysburg.

That is what Sigurd Olson was thinking as he wrote about the beauty of our State and this Earth and its stewardship.

And that is what an Iron Range miner was hoping for as he saved those dollars in that coffee can, never dreaming his granddaughter would end up in the United States Senate.

After 150 years, we celebrate the courage and forethought of those who came before us and pray that we can live up to their expectations.

Happy birthday, Minnesota!

CONGRATULATING CARRIS REELS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate Carris Reels of Rutland, VT, for receiving the 2008 ESOP Association's ''Company of the Year'' award.

Founded in 1951 by Henry Carris, and bought by his son, Bill Carris, in 1980, Carris Reels sells a full line of manufactured reel products for a wide variety of industries. Today, Carris Reels has about 550 employee owners and