

NOT VOTING—4

Hastings (WA)	Millender-McDonald	Pickering Young (AK)
---------------	--------------------	----------------------

□ 2136

So the bill was passed. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STEM CELL RESEARCH ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2005

(Mr. SCHIFF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, embryonic stem cell research has the potential to lead to cures of debilitating diseases affecting millions of people. Well-respected medical experts from many of our Nation's finest institutions have been seeking cooperation from the Federal Government for this research and have been stymied by the cell lines available under current law.

H.R. 810, a bill which I am proud to be an original cosponsor of, provides strong, ethical guidelines that ensure high standards in stem cell research. It also provides hope to countless people who live each day less sure of their future.

Some would suggest we must choose between lifesaving research on the one hand and high moral standards on the other. This is a false choice. We can and must have both. H.R. 810 gives hope to the ill and maintains America's high ethical purpose. It has my full support.

STEM CELL RESEARCH

(Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks and include therein extraneous material.)

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 810, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act.

Stem cell research holds the potential to improve the lives of millions of Americans suffering from diseases like cancer, heart disease, and diabetes. I believe we should do all we can to support this research, and it is why I am so frustrated at the Bush administration's attempts to stop it.

NIH said that U.S. scientists are falling behind because of the Bush 2001 limitations on stem cell research. Elizabeth Nable of the National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute said, "Because U.S. researchers who depend on Federal funds lack access to newer human embryonic stem cell lines, they are at a technological disadvantage relative to researchers funded by California, as well as investigators in Asia and Europe.

My home State of California has already moved ahead of the Federal Government by establishing the Institute for Regenerative Medicine, which will devote \$3 billion to embryonic stem cell research over the next 10 years.

This bill is a modest proposal compared to California's, but it is still an important step; and that is why it is supported by all the major educational research institutions in California.

I include their letter of support in the RECORD. Let us not drive this research overseas.

MAY 19, 2005.

Hon. ZOE LOFGREN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE LOFGREN: We are writing to express our support for changing federal policy on human embryonic stem cell research to allow an expansion in available cell lines. As you probably know, a vote on legislation that would alter current policy is expected in the coming weeks, and we urge your "Yes" vote.

Embryonic stem cells hold the potential for new cures and therapies for an array of life-threatening diseases affecting millions of Americans across the nation. This potential will be enhanced by the bipartisan Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act (H.R. 810), introduced by Representatives Michael Castle (R-DE) and Diana DeGette (D-CO) and co-sponsored by more than 200 members of the House of Representatives.

The Castle-DeGette bill would expand current policy to allow federal funding for research with stem cell lines discovered after the mandated August 9, 2001, cut-off date as well as lines derived in the future. With regard to future stem cell lines, the bill applies only to lines derived from days-old blastocysts that otherwise would be discarded from in vitro fertilization clinics, but that instead are voluntarily donated to research by consenting individuals, without compensation. Further, this legislation would ensure the development of ethical guidelines for research with embryonic stem cell lines.

California has moved ahead by establishing the Institute for Regenerative Medicine, which will devote \$3 billion to embryonic stem cell research over the next ten years. The provisions within H.R. 810 are more restrictive than those of the California Initiative; however, H.R. 810 is crucial because it will make a significant difference to nationwide federal research programs. This expansion in policy will further facilitate and accelerate the research conducted in our state.

When the current federal embryonic stem cell research policy went into effect in 2001, the notion was that 78 cell lines would be available for research. Currently, only 22 are actually available to researchers; many others have been found unsuitable. Furthermore, a number of the available lines are entangled with commercial interests making the cells too expensive or impossible for NIH-funded investigators to obtain. For these reasons, the existing embryonic stem cell lines do not provide a sufficient supply to advance the research to its full potential.

Embryonic stem cells offer the potential to reverse diseases and disabilities experienced by millions of Americans. Stem cell research is still very new. Thus, we have a collective responsibility—scientists, university leaders, and government leaders—to support the exploration of the promising possibilities of both embryonic and adult stem cell research for curing and preventing disease.

Please support scientific advancement and the possibility of new cures by voting "Yes" on H.R. 810 to expand federal stem cell research policy.

Sincerely,

ROBERT C. DYNES,
President, University
of California.

STEVEN B. SAMPLE,
President, University
of Southern California.

DAVID BALTIMORE,
President, California
Institute of Technology.

JOHN L. HENNESSY,
President, Stanford
University.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

OIL INDUSTRY AND OPEC PRICE GOUGING

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, not too long ago we passed the so-called energy bill here in the House, and tonight we passed the Energy and Water Development appropriations bill. The question that the American people should ask as we head into the Memorial Day weekend is, what has the Republican Congress done to rein in price gouging by the oil industry and the OPEC oil cartel? The answer, if you look at these two bills, is: Nothing. Absolutely nothing. Nada. Zip.

If you would listen to the Republican President from the oil industry, the Republican Vice President rich from the oil industry, and the Republican Congress replete with donations from the oil industry, they are powerless in the face of so-called market forces to do anything about the price gouging of the American people.

Now, if this were really just supply and demand, maybe, maybe you could understand that. But it is a little more than that. The OPEC oil cartel conspires to restrict supply and drive up the price of oil in violation of all the so-called free trade agreements that this Republican Congress and this Republican President say should rule the world.

The World Trade Organization, well, I have asked this President four times now in writing to file a complaint about this illegal activity by the OPEC cartel. It violates the rules of the World Trade Organization, of which this President is such a great fan. Now, why will he not file a complaint? Of seven of the OPEC cartel, six are in the World Trade Organization and one wants to join. Tremendous leverage. File a complaint about their illegal activity. Save the American people from cartels that price-gouge them.

But, no, the President will not do that. Why is that? It is because the oil companies, from which the President has sprung forth, and the Vice President make a lot of money on this.

Every time the oil cartels raise the price about two bucks a barrel, well, they take that plus another 10 percent for profit. So the higher the price, the bigger their profit.

If you look at the quarterly statements of the largest oil companies in the world, ExxonMobil and others, they are awash in tens of billions of dollars of cash extracted 10, 20, 30 cents at a time in excess profits from the American people at the pump.

Now, this is hurting real people. But this administration says they are powerless. This Republican Congress says they are powerless. They cannot take on the OPEC cartel. They cannot take on the price-gouging oil industry. They pass so-called energy legislation that says maybe 10, 12, 15 years from now, if there is any oil in ANWR, and if we can pump it, and if they do not take too big of a markup or price gouge on that, it will provide some price relief. That is their answer.

Today, in this bill there was nothing. They could not even adopt the minimalist study of what the OPEC cartel is doing to the American people. That was not allowed by the Republican majority. And they certainly could not allow the amendment that would stop the United States Government from buying from the oil companies at this extortionate price and pumping that oil into the ground for a future crisis.

This is a crisis now, today, for working American men and women, people who have to commute to work in my district by car. Small businesses across this country and big businesses and the airlines are going broke. But this administration says they are powerless, they can do nothing.

Well, guess what? The United States of America can do better, but we just have to get rid of the oil cartel. Not the OPEC oil cartel, but the oil cartel running the United States Congress and the White House and the Vice President's office.

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

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

□ 2145

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to assume the Special Order time of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

U.S. SHOULD WITHDRAW FROM IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, Hamid Karzai, the President of Afghanistan, criticized the U.S. in a graduation speech in Boston on Sunday. He said the U.S. had "the power and hence the responsibility" to get involved in Afghanistan even before the tragic events we refer to as 9/11. President Karzai said because the U.S. did not get involved sooner, the result was "horrible suffering for the Afghan people."

This is a man who was given a hero's welcome at the White House, the State and Defense Departments, and the World Bank just yesterday. This is a man who was a special guest at two joint sessions of Congress. This is a man who probably would not be president today if not for the U.S., and to whom our taxpayers have given billions of dollars since September of 2001.

It takes a lot of gall for President Karzai to come to the U.S. and blame us for the horrible suffering of the Afghan people because we did not get involved in Afghanistan in a big way before 2001.

Since 2001, U.S. taxpayers have sent billions to Afghanistan for economic, humanitarian, and reconstruction assistance. We have sent several hundreds of millions of dollars each year, in addition to what the military is spending, and most of what the military is doing in Iraq and Afghanistan is pure foreign aid. No country in the history of the world has even come close to doing as much for other countries as has the United States. No country in the history of the world has even come close to doing as much for Afghanistan as has the United States. Yet President Karzai comes here and makes a major speech and instead of thanking the American people over and over, as he should have, he criticizes us for not getting involved sooner.

Just yesterday, the front page of The Washington Post carried a story about the parents of Pat Tillman who was killed by friendly fire in Afghanistan. The parents bitterly attacked the Army for lying and covering up the details of their son's death, and they have every right to do so. Pat Tillman's dad said, "They blew up their poster boy" and then lied about it to create a "patriotic fervor" in the U.S.

I voted to go to war in Afghanistan because I and everyone but one in Congress felt we had to respond to 9/11, but we should have gotten out of there after 3 or 4 months; and if we had, Pat Tillman would still be alive today.

I voted against going to war in Iraq because, among many other reasons, Saddam Hussein's total military budget was only a little over two-tenths of 1 percent of ours, and he was no threat to us whatsoever. It is no criticism of the military to say this was a totally unnecessary war.

Unless conservatives now believe in massive foreign aid, huge deficit spending, world government and placing almost the entire burden of enforcing U.N. resolutions on our taxpayers and our military, all things that conservatives have opposed in the past, then conservatives should want us to get out of both Iraq and Afghanistan.

William F. Buckley, Jr., the godfather of conservatism, wrote a column a few days ago saying it is now time to exit Iraq. Many leaders of our military will want us to stay in Iraq and Afghanistan for many years so they can get higher and higher appropriations. But in a few months, our national debt will reach \$9 trillion. By the end of this fiscal year, we will have spent over \$300 billion in Iraq and Afghanistan and probably another \$100 billion in the coming fiscal year which starts October 1.

Mr. Speaker, seven more Americans were killed in Iraq yesterday. Our colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR), just told me that four guardsmen from his State were killed today. Already this month has been one of the bloodiest of the entire war. The headlines on the front page of the Washington Times says: "Car bombings kill scores across Iraq."

Our Founding Fathers did not intend for us to run Iraq or Afghanistan or any other country. Our first obligation should be to the American people and no one else. We should be friends to other countries, but we cannot afford to continue spending hundreds of billions all over the world.

In just a few years we will not be able to pay our own people all the Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, drug costs, military and civil service and private pensions that we have promised. To stay any longer in Iraq or Afghanistan goes against every traditional conservative position. We can no longer afford it in either blood or treasury.

PASS H.R. 2560, THE ELAINE SULLIVAN ACT

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

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced legislation, H.R. 2560, that is specifically designed to save lives and reduce suffering. It is a small, but significant, measure to protect the voiceless and the vulnerable.

In an instant, a wrong turn, a sudden fall, a missed step, someone, indeed anyone, can find himself or herself in a crisis and in need of emergency medical care.

In California alone, nearly 10 million people require emergency room care every year. And of those, 1.5 million arrive in critical condition. In fact, nationwide, nearly 1 million people arrive in emergency rooms each year unconscious or physically unable to give informed consent to their care.