

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I will attempt to read from an e-mail which was sent from a young ensign aboard the U.S.S. *Winston Churchill* to his parents. The *Churchill* is an *Arleigh Burke*-class AEGIS guided-missile destroyer, commissioned March 10, 2001, and is the only active U.S. Navy warship named after a foreign national.

I read: "Dear Dad: We are still at sea. The remainder of our port visits have all been canceled. We have spent every day since the attacks going back and forth within imaginary boxes drawn in the ocean, standing high-security watches and trying to make the best of it. We have seen the articles and the photographs, and they are sickening. Being isolated, I do not think we appreciate the full scope of what is happening back home, but we are definitely feeling the effects.

"About 2 hours ago, we were hailed by a German Navy destroyer, *Lutjens*, requesting permission to pass close by our port side. Strange, since we were in the middle of an empty ocean, but the captain acquiesced and we prepared to render them honors from our bridge wing. As they were making their approach, our conning officer used binoculars and announced that the *Lutjens* was flying not the German but the American flag. As she came alongside us, we saw the American flag flying at half mast and her entire crew topside standing at silent, rigid attention in their dress uniforms.

"They had made a sign that was displayed on her side that read "We Stand by You." There was not a dry eye on the bridge as we stayed alongside for a few minutes and saluted. It was the most powerful thing I have seen in my life. The German Navy did an incredible thing for this crew, and it has truly been the highest point in the days since the attacks. It is amazing to think that only a half-century ago things were quite different.

"After *Lutjens* pulled away, the officer of the deck, who had been planning to get out later this year, turned to me and said, "I'm staying Navy."

Mr. Speaker, to our German friends we can only say, *danke schoen*. To our countrymen and colleagues I say, be of strong heart, we are not alone. We will prevail.

Mr. Speaker, before I yield back, a number of colleagues have asked if they could get copies of this e-mail as well as photos of the Navy destroyer *Lutjens*. They can get that by simply going to my Web address at gil.house.gov.

PEDIATRIC EXCLUSIVITY BILL

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

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on a bill that will be

coming to the floor soon. H.R. 2887 is commonly called the pediatric exclusivity bill. This was a good bill. It was passed and implemented back in 1997. It had a 5-year sunset, so it is necessary for Congress to reauthorize the pediatric exclusivity bill.

Pediatric exclusivity simply says this: If a drug company that currently has a drug on the market will do an exclusive study for young people, those 18 or under, we will grant to them a patent extension for 6 years.

It is amazing, but as drug companies put forth drugs, they were not required to see what the effect would be on young people. Thus, we created the pediatric exclusivity bill to make sure an opportunity was provided to have studies done to make sure the proper dosage, the amount and the type of drug, would be beneficial to young people, those under 18 years of age. Just for agreeing to do a study that the FDA wants for young people, a drug company can get its patent extended. That is of great benefit to the drug company, of course, because they hold the patent and make money off the drug, and this bill is now due to be reauthorized.

As we move through this bill in our Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, there are a number of improvements we would like to see made with the bill. While there have been a number of improvements made already, there is still one part of the bill that troubles me, and hopefully, I will be able to offer an amendment to correct this inequity in the bill. What my amendment would say is that if we provide a pediatric exclusivity, before that patent extension is provided, the drug company must make the necessary label changes on a product that has been studied.

In fact, I would like to quote the FDA's report to the Congress dated January of this year. It says, and I quote, "The ultimate goal of encouraging pediatric studies is to provide needed dosing and safety information to the physicians in product labeling." To paraphrase, and I want to emphasize, "The goal of pediatric exclusivity is the labeling." It is the labeling where we find out how much to give, the safety information, and who should be given it. That is why I must offer my amendment when this bill comes to the floor. My amendment would tie the grant of exclusivity to the necessary labeling changes.

There have been 33 drugs approved for pediatric exclusivity, but only 20 of them have made the needed changes on the label. How would a doctor, a parent, or a patient who is under 18 know what is the right dosage or if this drug is safe for them without this information? Currently, the exclusivity period is given only for conducting studies. For the safety of our children, for our health care system, this must and should be changed.

Take, for example, one of the drugs that has been granted pediatric exclusivity, Eli Lilly's drug Prozac. The benefit to the public, specifically parents, patients and pediatricians, is zero, because the manufacturer has yet to place any information in the public record regarding the pediatric dosing or other data relating to the drug's safety in juvenile populations. Just for doing a study, for doing very little to aid our understanding of the operation of this antidepressant drug, they are allowed to have the pediatric exclusivity, to make the money, but not without giving us full disclosure of the needed safety information. That information on Prozac is never given to doctors, parents and patients on how it affects young people.

Sadly, physicians and parents have no way of knowing what the results of the study were on Prozac regarding the myriad of presumed uses of Prozac in young people. Unless Eli Lilly elects to tell us, we do not know what testing occurred, in what specific age groups, what dosage, or what reactions. Pediatricians, parents, and patients have no information; they are literally left in the dark.

When the current bill comes to the floor, it will only require that manufacturers in the future will be required to label their products after the results are known. But that knowledge will not be given until 11 months after the product is on the market. That gives them 11 months to negotiate with the FDA in a secret proceeding, unless the FDA is prepared to declare a product misbrand, and the FDA has been reluctant to do so.

Under my labeling amendment, which I hope to bring to the floor, all new drugs must complete the labeling requirement before the product is marketed. I cannot understand why we allow drug manufacturers to undertake a pediatric study but not provide the doctors, the patients, and the parents with the results of this study and the information they need to make it available.

FOOLISHNESS OF FIAT

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, the world's politicians, special interests, government bureaucrats, and financiers all love fiat money because they all benefit from it. But freedom-loving, hard-working, ethical and thrifty individuals suffer.

Fiat money is paper money that gets its value from a government edict and compulsory legal tender laws. Honest money, something of real value, like a precious metal, gets its value from the market and through voluntary exchange. The world today is awash in

fiat money like never before, and we face a financial crisis like never before, conceived many decades before the 9-11 crisis hit.

Fiat money works as long as trust in the currency lasts. But eventually trust is always withdrawn from paper money. Fiat money evolves out of sound money, which always originates in the market, but paper money inevitably fails no matter how hard the beneficiaries try to perpetuate the fraud. We are now witnessing the early stages of the demise of a worldwide financial system built on the fiction that wealth can come out of a printing press or a computer at our central banks.

Japan, failing to understand this, has tried for more than a decade to stimulate her economy and boost her stock market by printing money and increasing government spending, and it has not worked. Argentina, even with the hopes placed in its currency board, is nevertheless facing default on its foreign debt and a crisis in confidence. More bailouts from the IMF and U.S. dollar may temper the crisis for a while, but ultimately it will only hurt the dollar and the U.S. taxpayers.

We cannot continually bail out others with expansion of the dollar money supply, as we have with the crisis in Turkey, Argentina, and the countries of Southeast Asia. This policy has its limits, and confidence in the dollar is the determining factor. Even though, up until now, confidence has reigned, encouraged by our political and economic strength, this era is coming to an end. Our homeland has been attacked, our enemies are not easily subdued, our commitments abroad are unsustainable, and our economy is fast slipping into chaos.

Printing money is not an answer, yet that is all that is offered. The clamor for low-interest rates by all those who benefit from fiat money has prompted the Fed to create new money out of thin air like never before. Driving the Fed funds rate down from 6.5 percent to 2.5 percent, a level below the price inflation rate, represents nothing short of panic and has done nothing to recharge the economy. But as one would expect, confidence in the dollar is waning.

I am sure, due to the crisis, a faith in fiat and a failure to understand the business cycle, the Fed will continue with the only thing it knows to do: credit creation and manipulation of interest rates.

□ 1815

This policy reflects the central bank's complete ignorance as to the cause of the problem: Credit creation and manipulation of interest rates.

Since the Federal Reserve first panicked in early January, it has created \$830 billion of fiat money out of thin air. The country is no richer. The econ-

omy is weaker. The stock market has continued downward, and unemployment has skyrocketed. Returning to deficit spending, as we already have, will not help us any more than it helped Japan, which continues to sink into economic morass.

Nothing can correct the problems we face if we do not give up on the foolishness of fiat.

Mr. Speaker, a dollar crisis is quickly approaching. We should prepare ourselves.

FOURTH WTO MINISTERIAL CONFERENCE SHOULD NOT BE HELD IN QATAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, today we are preparing to send a letter to the President of the United States expressing the displeasure of many Members and genuine concern about the administration decision to send a delegation from our countries to the World Trade Organization's fourth ministerial conference in Qatar. That is to occur next week.

We are writing to express our deep reservations about the appropriateness of that venue in light of recent actions by the monarchy in Qatar, not to mention the obvious security concerns for our citizens.

We are deeply disappointed by the failure of the Qatari monarchy to support U.S. military action in Afghanistan. In fact, the President of the United States has said Nations should choose sides. Well, Qatar has chosen the wrong side. Indeed, in this war against terrorism, Qatar has decided to sit on the sidelines, and at worst to condemn U.S. military action; so why are we sending a delegation there?

Indeed, the government of Qatar has condemned the air campaign against the Taliban and refused to make its airports and infrastructure available to U.S. forces. On October 23, Qatari Foreign Minister Sheikh Hamad bin-Jassem bin-Jabr al-Thani condemned, and that is a quote, the allied attacks on Afghanistan and called them unacceptable.

What is unacceptable is the notion that Doha, Qatar is an appropriate site for the World Trade Organization ministerial.

Mr. Speaker, we will be asking the President to prevail on the World Trade Organization officials to move the ministerial to another location in light of the government of Qatar's opposition to the war on terrorism.

The government of Qatar should be made to understand that its failure to support the coalition in the campaign against terrorism has consequences, and it is not business as usual.

In the Financial Times today, there is an article indicating that Vice Presi-

dent CHENEY disregarded fears over the WTO choosing the venue of Qatar for this meeting. In fact, it says that the White House disregarded security concerns among top U.S. trade officials this month by committing Washington to sending a delegation to the meeting of the World Trade Organization previously scheduled for Qatar.

It mentions that U.S. Government security experts on Friday warned business lobbyists planning to accompany the delegation that there were substantial risks in attending the meeting in the small Gulf state.

One delegation member was very concerned about Mr. CHENEY's call and said, "I think this is a momentarily bad call based upon what we have learned about security risks there."

It is no secret this organization calls itself the World Trade Organization, and when those two Trade Towers came down in New York, those were the Twin World Trade Towers. There is a message here, and it is a pretty important one.

For the RECORD, I will be including information on Qatar's policy of denying its own people fundamental rights. In fact, the government officially prohibits such things as public worship by non-Muslims. Our own CIA Fact Book indicates that the people of Qatar do not even have the right to vote, and freedom of speech is severely limited. I could not be giving this speech in Qatar.

In addition, like the Taliban, the rulers of Qatar oppress women, and women occupy a strictly subservient role inside that society.

I think it is fair to say that trade has failed to bring freedom to Qatar. In fact, the U.S. State Department calls oil the cornerstone of Qatar's economy, accounting for more than 70 percent of total government revenue in that country. Starting in 1973, oil production there increased dramatically, but freedom certainly has not followed.

We are constantly told how freedom takes root in unfree countries if we simply trade, whether it is Vietnam, China or Qatar. That logic is simply not true. Despite billions upon billions of dollars worth of engagement between Western commercial interests and Qatar, the people of Qatar have no freedom of speech, no freedom of assembly, no freedom of religion, no freedom of association.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Bush and Cheney administration to seriously review the decision that they have made to send a delegation to Qatar and to find a location that is safer in view of these very troubled times.

The material previously referred to is as follows: