

Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), to demand for their release, but also for a voice of the United States, the kind of voice we had with the hostages in Iran.

Let us have a voice as we parallel to fight terrorism and to fight against the Taliban. Have them give our people back and let our voices be loud.

Mr. Speaker, let me briefly thank the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS) for what she has been doing in acknowledging those who lost their lives on September 11, 2001. As I begin to call their names, and I may not be able to conclude it, but I want to call their names and ask apologies of their families if I mispronounce them:

Harold Lizcano, Martin Lizzul, George Llanes, Elizabeth Claire "Beth" Logler, Catherine Lisa LoGuidice, Jerome Lohez, Michael Lomax, Stephen V. Long, Laura M. Longing, Salvatore Lopes, David Lopez, Maclovio "Joe" Lopez, George Lopez, Manuel "Manny" L. Lopez, Leobarbo Lopez, Daniel Lopez, Israel P. Lopez, Luis M. Lopez, Chet Louie, Stuart Seid Louis, Joseph Lovero, Sara Low, Michael W. Lowe, Garry Lozier, John Peter Lozowsky, Charles Peter Lucania, Edward "Ted" Hobbs Luckett, II, Mark G. Ludvigsen, Lee Charles Ludwig, Sean Thomas Lugano, Daniel Lugo, Jin Lui, Marie Lukas, William Lum, Jr., Michael P. Lunden, Christopher Lunder, Anthony Luparello, Gary Lutnick, Linda Luzzicone, Alexander Lygin, CeeCee Lyles, and Lyn Corea Gray.

They are all people. They lost their lives on September 11, 2001. It is the challenge of this House to pay tribute to them in the works we do and also to bring our hostages home.

TRIBUTE TO BENNY H. POTTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATSON of California. Mr. Speaker, Veterans Day, a few days ago, was very significant to someone in my district. I want to pay tribute to Benny H. Potter, a resident of the West Adams community in Los Angeles. He lived there for a decade, and was a veteran of the Second World War. He passed away recently. He was greatly loved and respected by all in the community who knew him.

Mr. Benny, or Uncle Benny as he was affectionately called, was born on August 21, 1919, in Albuquerque, New Mexico. His family migrated to Los Angeles in 1925. During World War II, he was assigned to the 10th Cavalry Division, which sent him to North Africa to serve under General George Patton. He later served in Italy and Germany and had the honor of marching in the V-E Day Parade in Paris, France.

Mr. Potter served his country with distinction. His family recently received a letter of commendation from

the President of the United States for his distinguished service. He received four decorations for his service: The American Campaign Medal, the European-African-Middle Eastern Campaign Medal, the Good Conduct Medal, and the Victory Medal.

At Mr. Potter's memorial service, four generations of relatives spoke. Two generations still live in the West Adams area. Numerous friends and neighbors saluted him with songs and words of praise, and I promised to give him the flag in his memory that I received after I served as Ambassador to Micronesia because he so well represented our country and our family abroad.

At 81 years of age, Benny Potter was still the neighborhood gardener and handyman. He would bring magazines to elderly neighbors and was always ready with uplifting stories or sage advice for everyday problems. Mr. Potter was also the hub of an informal neighborhood news network. One neighbor described him by saying simply: "He was the best. He was CNN, the Sports Channel, the Weather Bureau, and he was my friend."

On this Veterans Day past, I think we should look back on all the contributions of our veterans, as we will be looking forward on those who have fought in this most recent war in Afghanistan. Veterans like Benny Potter risked their lives to protect our country and their communities. But once back home, his contributions continued.

Benny H. Potter, a man who never met a stranger, leaves a legacy of which we all may be proud, and he made us so much better. He serves as a shining example of the spirit which drove our veterans to serve their communities in both war and peace and the spirit with which many of our young men and women will be coming back from fighting in a country so far away that they really did not know where it was on the map. This is a tribute to that kind of spirit that honors our country and makes us the greatest country in the world.

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 urge Members to vote against H.R. 2887, the Pediatric Exclusivity bill, as it will appear on the suspension calendar tomorrow. It has a number of controversial provisions.

First approved in 1997, pediatric exclusivity granted the drug companies an extension of 6 months under patents if they would provide a study to determine if the drug was beneficial to young people. The FDA invites drug companies to do a study on what effect

the drug may have on young people. Upon completion of the study, the FDA then grants a pediatric exclusivity to the drug, which the drug companies then use as a marketing tool to promote and increase drug sales.

The grant of pediatric exclusivity takes place after the drug company study is completed, without anyone knowing what the study says about the safety, the effectiveness, or the dosage requirement for young people. There is no requirement to change the labeling on a drug to reflect the changes that may be needed when a drug is dispensed to young people. There is no label to tell doctors, patients, or their families on the proper dosage or on how to dispense or use the drug.

□ 1500

Before we grant pediatric exclusivity to a drug and before this pediatric exclusivity is marketed as approved for pediatric use, we should know what is the effect of this drug on young people.

Under the bill that will be before us tomorrow, H.R. 2887, after a study is completed, exclusivity is granted; but the results of the study, the results may not be disclosed to the doctors, patients and their families for up to 11 months. The physician, the patient and the family has a right to know about the drug the patient is about to ingest. Why does it take 11 months?

This chart highlights the problems with pediatric exclusivity. There have been 33 drugs granted pediatric exclusivity, and only 20 have been relabeled; and it takes an average of 9 months to do that. The average time from the granting of pediatric exclusivity is 9 months. For 9 months, doctors, patients and their families have no idea if the child is receiving a proper dosage and if the drug is really safe.

On this chart, exclusivity granted, and below in parentheses was when the label was provided. In Lodine, it took 9 months for them to change the label, and after the label was changed, approximately two times a lower dose recommended. It should have been cut in half. Nobody knew that for 9 months.

Buspar, if Members take a look at it, 2 months after exclusivity is granted, they finally say safety and effectiveness were not established in patients 6 to 17 years old. In other words, it did not do anything. They are marketing it as a drug to help the patient.

How about Fluxvoxamine. Again, exclusivity granted January 3, 2000. Eight months later the label is changed. It says it may require lower dosage, and it gives an age group.

Propofol, exclusivity is granted August 11, 1999; but they did not change the label to let the doctors, patients, and families know until 18 months later. It says here "may result in serious bradycardia." It goes on to say it is

not indicated for pediatric ICU sedation, as safety has not been established. That is information doctors need to know.

The worse thing is, the incidence of mortality doubles from 4 percent to 9 percent. That is information we need to know. Doctors, patients, and families should know this information before we grant pediatric exclusivity. My amendment would require not just a study but proper labeling on the drug before it is granted pediatric exclusivity and marketed.

Pediatric exclusivity is the only time that labeling is not a prerequisite to granting a drug approval. Why would we want to endanger our children?

Mr. Speaker, I cannot offer my amendment under the suspension calendar. In order to have an opportunity to offer my amendment to protect the health and safety of our young people in this country, we must defeat the bill under the suspension calendar and send the bill to the Committee on Rules where I will be given an opportunity to offer my amendment.

I do not understand why the majority does not want doctors, patients, and families to know the effect of the drug, what is the effectiveness of the drug, and is the drug safe for our children. Tomorrow I ask Members to defeat the bill under suspension so we can bring it back to the floor.

STRATEGY FOR GLOBAL FIGHT AGAINST TERRORISM

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call for the creation of a new organization very much like the NATO organization to help us in the global fight against terrorism. NATO was the most successful organization in the modern history of the world for creating a cooperative defense structure. In fewer than 50 years, its principal enemy imploded without NATO ever having to declare war or engage in serious hostilities against that enemy, the former Soviet Union. Why did NATO succeed? I believe it succeeded for three reasons. First, there was a clear and obvious threat and enemy, the former Soviet Union.

Second, defense against that threat was larger than any one country could handle. It required cooperation among Nations.

Third, it was much more intelligent and efficient to have that cooperation so that costs, both economic and military, could be shared.

The synergy that was created by the integration of the NATO countries permitted those NATO countries to forcefully make the argument to the rest of the world that the way of life that is based upon the rule of law, tolerance

and freedom and the free enterprise system was far superior to the world view that NATO was opposed to.

Today we are faced with a very different threat. It is the threat of an international network of terrorists who seek to destroy anyone who does not share their view of life and the world. That threat is not manageable by any one country. Even this one, as mighty and as powerful as it is, cannot defeat the threat of terrorism by itself.

President Bush and the members of his administration have done an exemplary job since September 11, 2001, in knitting together an alliance of civilized nations and peoples everywhere in revulsion against the acts of September 11. That same kind of integration is necessary on a permanent basis to win the war against terrorism.

Finally, the resources that are needed, the money, the intelligence, the arms, are much more powerful if they are multiplied and shared among nations.

I believe that the first place to start with the creation of this new NATO is on the question of the development and deployment of national missile defense. As our President this week meets with President Putin of Russia, they have made great progress toward agreement between our two countries on the necessity of developing and deploying a weapon shield that would prevent innocent people from being attacked by an accidental or rogue strike of an intercontinental ballistic missile.

I believe that shield must be constructed by far more than just two nations. I believe that to succeed against the new common enemy of the terrorist network, against the likelihood or certainty that that network will achieve the ability to deploy and use strategic weapons, that we need the creation of a new type of structure that follows and tracks NATO. We need a NATO for the 21st century. It should not be bound by geography the way the NATO that followed World War II was.

I believe it should not even be bound by ideology as the first NATO was. It needs to be bound together by the common interest in preparing for the likelihood, some would say the certainty, of attack by terrorists with strategic weapons. Our President is taking an important first step in that regard in his meetings with the Russian president this week. I and the members of the other body wish him well. We need to build on the success that I believe will come this week.

In the defense authorization bill which passed this Chamber and is now in conference with the other body, there is report language that was inserted at my request that encourages the administration to build on an existing regional missile defense system called the MEADS system. Presently, Italy and Spain have joined with the United States in pursuing this system.

I believe that this instruction to the Department of Defense and our administration can lay the foundation for the development of a new NATO for the 21st century that will reach across nations, across oceans, across ideological divides to build and deploy a common defense shield against the use of the worst weapons of destruction by the worst destroyers that we have seen in the modern history of the world.

On September 11, 2000, people would have said it was alarmist to worry about the construction of such a shield. On August 11, 2001, others still would have said that. But no one can say after the events of September 11, 2001, that any hideous evil is beyond the reach and imagination of people who are sworn to destroy us in these terrorist networks.

We can hope that they do not get access to the weapons of mass destruction, or assume that they will. I believe we must prevent them from getting them with every fiber of our strength, but we also must assume that there will be failures and they will get access to these weapons. The only way to sustain a defense against this likelihood or probability is the creation of a defensive shield. I believe the only way to successfully create that shield is to follow the lessons of our predecessors when they built NATO: recognize the common threat of terrorism, recognize the futility of any one nation dealing with that common threat by itself, recognize the advantages of knitting together the resources of many nations to build that shield.

When we do, the prosperity that will result, the humanity that will result, the respect among nations that will result, will provide the best evidence for those who are not under the shield that they should change their own governments, change their own countries and come within the protective shield of that umbrella.

Mr. Speaker, it is not a partisan issue. It is not an issue between the legislative and executive branch. It is a matter of necessity. It is our time to learn the lessons which followed World War II, to build on the successes of World War II and build a permanent structure for peace, not only on the land but in the skies and in the heavens.

I believe that the proper way to do that is by the construction and maintenance of a NATO-type structure that will defend us in space and in the air against the threat of errant or rogue or terrorist intercontinental ballistic missiles. I would urge Congress to follow that course.

AIRLINE SAFETY

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