Improving protection for State and local witnesses will move us one step closer toward alleviating the fears of and threats to prospective witnesses, and help to safeguard our communities from violence.

While we cannot bring back all those who carried a heavy burden of fear due to witness intimidation, we can honor their sacrifice by taking the necessary steps today to fight against that future intimidation.

I urge my colleagues to join me in taking that critical step by cosponsoring, H.R. 908, the Witness Security and Protection Act.

AUSTRALIAN AND COALITION INVOLVEMENT IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CONAWAY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor tonight to make what might be a shocking announcement, and that is an announcement of something that has not been very available in the United States news media, something that needs to be acknowledged on the floor of this Congress. And that is that one of America's most reliable and possibly historically are the most reliable American ally, an American ally that has been with us in virtually every major conflict throughout the 20th century, and is with us today in Iraq as one of our strong coalition partners, joining together with Great Britain and the other 25 or so coalition partners that are there.

The nation of Australia has doubled their troop deployment to Iraq. They have done so at a time when there are other nations that are looking for opportunities to leave that area. And they have done so at a time with historical moment, when we are seeing people marching in the streets of Lebanon reaching out for freedom, acting upon the Bush Doctrine, standing up for freedom. The Australians are standing with us, as they stood with us in World War I, World War II, Vietnam and Korea and, as I said, virtually every major conflict.

The 900 or so troops that are in there now are there to defend, in an interesting irony, they are there to defend the Japanese, who have also deployed to Iraq to provide engineering and other services there in the country at a time when it is pivotal and significant that we help them continue to grasp the freedom that they did when they reached to go to the polls on January 30.

Now, the reason I make this announcement as an announcement is because I think it is pretty difficult for a regular American citizen who watches television every day and reads the paper every day, and maybe even surfs the Internet every day, to even know this significant piece of international news, a piece of international news that was published throughout a great number of Internet services, as well as mainstream media around the world, but not so well in the United States of America.

So, I looked around and I asked the question, how would a person know this?

I came across it because I picked up the Sunday newspaper in Sydney, Australia, and this is what I found. The countries that refuse to surrender, U.S., Australia and Britain, boost their troop numbers.

Great Britain increased their numbers there, as has the United States, as has now Australia. And the national news media that handled it here in this country were few and far between.

So how would a person go about finding this out?

Well, I will go to Al Jazeera's Web page and see if I can find this little piece of information that I happened to have been coincidentally privy to. And I find on Al Jazeera's Web page dated February 22, Australia to send more troops to Iraq.

I did not find that in major newspaper in America, with the exception of the Los Angeles Times and one other newspaper on the west coast. Not the Washington Post. Not the Washington Times. Not the New York Post, not the New York Times. Not generally available to Americans.

Mainstream media broadcast TV, most of the cable networks had a little story, one blip. But on the mainstream media that was not something that came out on Peter Jennings, Brian Williams and not Dan Rather. But it did come out of Al Jazeera.

These are our tried and true allies. The people that stood with us for over a century have doubled their troop commitments out of Australia, and there is a long list of them standing with us as allies, as has Great Britain, and as has a number of the other coalition partners.

We need to recognize them, Mr. Speaker. We need to acknowledge them. We need to thank them for their service, not just to the support of the coalition troops, but their service to the freedom of humanity. And I challenge the news media to pick this up and try to scoop Al Jazeera next time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

BUSINESS-AS-USUAL WITH FDA NOT GOOD ENOUGH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the problematic FDA approval process. In recent weeks, we have learned that the Federal Drug Administration has established an independent board to review post-market drug safety issues. We have also learned that the FDA committee issued a recommendation to return Vioxx to the market and keep Bextra and Celebrex on the market.

On the surface, it would seem the FDA has taken measures to address drug safety issues. However, we know all too well the devil is always in the details, and by looking at these details, it is clear that it is just business as usual at the FDA.

Take the committee that issued the recent recommendations on the COX–2 inhibitors. Ten of the 32 drug advisers had ties to the pharmaceutical industry and, in fact, had received consulting fees in the past from the drug manufacturers. I wonder how they voted? Nine to one to keep the drugs on the market.

Without the votes of these industry consultants, the committee would have recommended withdrawal of Bextra from the market and keep Vioxx off the market. We will never know if their votes are the result of an actual conflict of interest.

Yet to stay above the ethical fray, there should not even be an appearance of conflict of interest at the FDA. Their job is too important. With nearly a third of the panel receiving consulting fees from the industry, the appearance of conflict of interest is undeniable.

Unfortunately, the newly-established Drug Safety Oversight Board will suffer from similar problems. Despite the claims that the board will be independent, all but two members of the board will be FDA employees. What is more, the board will include FDA employees from the Office of New Drugs, the entity that approved the drugs in the first place. What incentive would board members truly have to conclude the decisions made by the FDA were mistakes in judgment and should be reversed? Even less likely is the chance that the board members from the Office of New Drugs would vote to reverse their own decisions or those of their closest colleagues when it comes to drug safety.

Mr. Speaker, the makeup of this board is more incestuous than independent, and, unfortunately, this problem pervades the entire FDA approval process, not just approval of pharmaceuticals. We have experienced it in our own efforts to keep silicone breast implants off the market. When the implant manufacturers came before the FDA, 40 percent of the advisory panel was made up of plastic surgeons.

Needless to say, each of the plastic surgeons voted to approve silicone breast implants. There is a conflict of interest if I ever saw one, since plastic surgeons are virtually guaranteed more business if the FDA approves again the use of silicone breast implants.

Despite the panel's recommendation to approve the device, the FDA, thank goodness, recognized the need for additional clinical trials, and rejected that