

HEINONLINE

Citation: 2 An Act to Amend Title 35 United States Code with
to Patents on Biotechnological Processes Pub. L.
109 Stat. 351 S11144 1995

Content downloaded/printed from
HeinOnline (<http://heinonline.org>)
Tue Mar 19 17:44:08 2013

-- Your use of this HeinOnline PDF indicates your acceptance
of HeinOnline's Terms and Conditions of the license
agreement available at <http://heinonline.org/HOL/License>

-- The search text of this PDF is generated from
uncorrected OCR text.

Most of the other recommendations in this chapter do not require money. They require an investment of time, attention, and thoughtfulness by parents and other caring adults, by those in the news and entertainment fields, by educators and government officials. We are convinced that helping young people acquire and maintain strong personal values is an investment that will yield benefits for individuals and for society as a whole for years to come.

CONCLUSION

Americans have long celebrated and jealously guarded the nation's pluralism, viewing with appropriate skepticism those who would impose their own values or doctrines on others. Yet at the root of everything Americans hold dear about their country are fundamental values and rights that have sustained this nation in times of crisis and called forth our best when others are in need. As a society and as individual citizens, we would be well served to cultivate in our children these enduring values of human dignity, character, and citizenship.

In a free society, there will always be tension between freedom of expression and upholding common social values. Censorship is the antithesis of what we embrace. Forging common values will never depend solely on laws, but also on persuasion and example. Success will require thoughtful action and self-restraint by individuals and major institutions with the ability or potential to influence children's moral development. This makes the task of parents, public leaders, educators, media executives, entertainers, and advertisers more difficult, but no less important.

BIOTECHNOLOGY PATENT PROTECTION ACT OF 1991

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, it is interesting that the distinguished occupant of the chair is Senator DECONCINI of Arizona, because I am going to make a statement in support of the Biotechnology Patent Protection Act of 1991, and I understand from the work I have done that the distinguished occupant of the chair is the principal proponent of clarifying the patent laws of our Nation, so that such things as the research and the structure of the human anatomy, which we call genome research, where genes are being located within various chromosome structures. This work is yielding a whole new body of patentable or copyrightable ideas, and it needs to be clarified so we do it right, because we are fearful that we will get down the path with this research and find others are producing the cures, pharmaceuticals and drugs of the future. Obviously, genome and genome mapping is indeed the most significant health wellness activity of our Government. It will open the door to cures for hundreds of genetically-related diseases, and in the process, there will be many patentable items that are seriously different from items in the past. I understand the measure will help immensely with that problem.

Mr. President, I support the bill being sponsored by Mr. DECONCINI that would seek to ensure that American biotechnology companies are able to keep proprietary rights to the products that they develop. It has come to

my attention that a decision within In re Durden handed down by the courts 8 years ago has made it difficult to obtain process patents for biotechnology products. However, without this type of patent protection foreign companies are able to take DNA sequence knowledge created in this country overseas to produce products that can then legally be imported back into this country.

In fact this exact process occurred just recently with an American biotechnology company. The Amgen corporation had spent many years and millions of dollars creating a drug by the name of EPO. After obtaining a patent on both the gene for EPO and the microorganism used to produce this drug, Amgen began marketing this promising new product. Soon after this, however, a Japanese company by the name of Chugai Pharmaceuticals used this technology developed by Amgen to produce EPO in Japan and export it to the United States. Had there been a process patent for EPO the Process Patent Amendments Act of 1988 would have prevented the importation of EPO into this country.

Mr. President, I recently held a workshop dealing with technology transfer from the Human Genome Initiative to the American biotechnology industry. I was very pleased to hear of the remarkable progress that American scientists have made in deciphering the Human Genome. Within the last year scientists have found the genes for fragile X syndrome and Lou Gehrig's disease. At the same time medical doctors at the National Institutes of Health have conducted gene therapy aimed at treating a young girl afflicted with the same disease that tragically killed David, the "bubble boy," in 1984.

Further, the knowledge and technology developed by the Human Genome Initiative has provided a further stimulus to the young American biotechnology industry. Last year the biotechnology industry had an annual revenue of over \$2 billion and a stock market value of \$18 billion. The President's Council on Economic Competitiveness estimates that the domestic biotechnology industry will grow to \$50 billion in annual revenue by the year 2000.

Mr. President, everyone in this Chamber is aware of the great pain created by the loss of industries in the past to foreign competitors. The field of biotechnology was created almost exclusively by Americans and we still hold a commanding lead in almost every area of the industry. We must act, with legislation such as this bill sponsored by the distinguished Senator from Arizona, to ensure that biotechnology does not become one more industry that Americans created and then lost.

Mr. President, might I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has approximately 3 minutes remaining.

ECONOMIC STATUS OF AMERICANS

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, sometime ago, I guess about 4 or 5 days ago, July 24, or the day prior thereto, an article found itself in the Washington Post. It said, and I hold it here: "The Rich Got Richer, the Poor Got Poorer," the study says. "Think tank finds income gap widened in the 1980's."

Mr. President, let me suggest that the Senator from New Mexico has, on a previous occasion, challenged the conclusion of a report such as this, and there is nothing at all new about this one. In fact, if anything, the think tank that produced it is playing with numbers and percentages and dates and, might I say, even worse manner than the previous ones which the Senator from New Mexico attacked.

Let me just see if I can point up why this particular report does not mean what it says. Mr. President, this report starts with the year 1977, and it ends with the year 1988. It is purportedly indicating that the decade of the eighties, which I perceived to be 1981 through the first part of 1990, was a bad decade in that the rich got richer and the poorer got poorer.

Mr. President, let me suggest for those who are putting this kind of thing together that they recognize a couple of principles and go out and ask all their economic friends if they are not true. First, when you have a recession there are two truisms at least. One is the poor get poorer and the poor are hurt the most in a recession. The rich do not get hurt as much in a recession.

I cannot do anything about that, and no one who was in a policy-making position in the 1980's could really fix that. You can go back and check. The people that get hurt the most and the quickest are the poor.

What did they put in this study that makes it absolutely wrong? They put 1977 in, Mr. President, not 1981. They put in 1977, 1978, 1979, 1980, 1981, and part of 1982. Guess what those years were? They included the worst part of the 1970's and repercussions of the 1970's that fell on the early 1980's. And guess what existed during those 5½ years—two recessions, not one. The second one was a big recession, the one in the early years of Ronald Reagan when Federal Reserve Board Chairman, Paul Volcker, ratcheted up interest rates and said, "Let us have a recession and get rid of inflation."

What preceded it? What preceded that recession was the stagflation of the last 2 years of President Jimmy Carter: high interest rates, high inflation, and little or no real growth.

Who was getting hurt during those periods? The poor. The reason I say

41)

