

are clean fuels so that we consolidate the fuel blends we have in America. That is it. And then study and make sure we are doing it right. And if the study says there is another way to do it better, we will do that. That would be the fourth study we would have on this matter.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the majority whip and cosponsor of this legislation, for the purpose of closing.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and for the debate.

Both my friend from Wisconsin who feels strongly about this and my friend from Maine who has come to the floor, we have had a good debate on part of this bill, but only a very small part of this bill.

I would like to make a couple of points. Some of the things that my friend from Maine pointed out that we needed, we agree that we need many of those things. In fact, that is why we have the energy bill. We voted on it again today. We voted on it in both of the last two Congresses. We clearly do need energy policy. We encourage all those on this side of the building to work hard to try to get that done. We have voted on an energy conference report now, and now we voted on a bill today that was very much like it.

This brings one significant, but not very complicated, issue to the floor. I think, in fact, the center focus of this bill is so unarguable that nobody really argued about it. We have got too many fuel blends. Refineries have needlessly become profit centers in the distribution because there are too many fuel blends out there. Nobody really challenged that concept.

I heard a lot of discussion about one principle, the waiver principle, whether that was good or not. Let me tell the Members the waiver is very good if the refinery that services their area is somehow shut down. In fact, the waiver is desperately good, and we do not have that kind of ability now to just simply allow families and commerce to continue when one of these very unique fuels is suddenly unavailable anywhere. That is what the waiver is supposed to take care of.

But really the more central focus of this bill I did not really hear any real debate on. I am encouraged by that. I hope as we move forward with all kinds of energy legislation that we take strong consensus that there are too many fuel blends. We need a study to determine how we get a smaller number, and then we need to look for ways to encourage that smaller number of blends to become the number of fuel blends that communities look at in the future. We can make this system much more efficient. We can make it work more effectively. This is not designed to solve all the energy problems in the world; but if we adopted this bill, it would reduce gas prices. That is what the title calls for. I think we moved

this debate forward today, and I appreciate everybody's participation that was part of it.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4545, the "Gasoline Price Reduction Act." I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill, which relaxes Clean Air Act requirements and which has not been the subject of any hearings or markups by the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Because of the lack of hearings or markups, we have no idea whether the bill is actually necessary or whether its effect on gasoline prices will be positive or negative. We have no idea of the extent of its impact on air quality, except to note that its effect clearly cannot be positive.

This bill is very poorly drafted, which reflects the lack of input or review by anybody except its sponsors. We do not know what the benefits and cost of this bill will be and we do not have any analysis from the executive agencies, such as the Department of Energy and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), who could tell us whether it is a good or bad idea.

The bill allows EPA to waive Clean Air Act requirements in the event of a "significant fuel supply disruption." Yet the meaning of this term is not supplied. Nor are there limits placed on the length of the waiver or on the overall detriment to air quality that could occur. Nothing in the bill would require anyone to either analyze or ameliorate the impacts on air quality in any way, regardless of how easily or inexpensively that could be done.

The bill instructs EPA to give "preference" to particular fuels in approving state implementation plans, but what does it mean to give preference to a particular fuel? The bill also sets a cap on the total number of "fuels" in existence as of June 1, 2004. How many fuels is that? What is the definition of a "fuel"? Would this cap apply to more desirable fuels, such as low-sulfur diesel, or to renewable fuels, such as biodiesel or ethanol? How would this bill affect supply, energy dependence, and price structure in particular regional markets, such as Michigan?

High gas prices are of concern to all, but this bill is not the solution. We should examine the possible relationship between "boutique fuel" requirements and gas prices and determine, through regular committee process, an appropriate solution with input from all interested parties. I would welcome legislation that would lead to cleaner fuels and greater fungibility in the fuel supply.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill, and to give the Committee on Energy and Commerce a chance to address these matters properly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4545.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further

proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

INTENT TO ENTER INTO FREE TRADE AGREEMENT WITH BAHRAIN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 108-193)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Consistent with section 2105(a)(1)(A) of the Trade Act of 2002, (Public Law 107-210; the "Trade Act"), I am pleased to notify the Congress of my intent to enter into a Free Trade Agreement (FTA) with the Government of Bahrain.

This agreement will create new opportunities for America's workers, farmers, businesses, and consumers by eliminating barriers in trade with Bahrain. Entering into an FTA with Bahrain will not only strengthen our bilateral ties with this important ally, it will also advance my goal of a U.S.-Middle East Free Trade Area (MEFTA) by 2013.

Consistent with the Trade Act, I am sending this notification at least 90 days in advance of signing the United States-Bahrain FTA. My Administration looks forward to working with the Congress in developing appropriate legislation to approve and implement this free trade agreement.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, June 15, 2004.

NATO NEEDS TO AUGMENT INTERNATIONAL SECURITY ASSISTANCE FORCE IN AFGHANISTAN

(Mr. BEREUTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, following the stirring address of the President of Afghanistan this morning, this Member rises to address the urgent need for NATO to augment the International Security Assistance Force, or ISAF.

This Member cannot overstate how critical the next few weeks will be for the future of Afghanistan and for the credibility of the North Atlantic Alliance. Unless the NATO allies quickly remedy the grave shortfalls in military personnel and equipment, the NATO mission in Afghanistan faces a real danger of failure. There will be no security for the upcoming elections in the hinterland of Afghanistan.

Actually, this is a crucial failure of will, political will, purely and simply. We are not coming up in other countries with the pledged personnel and equipment. Make no mistake about it,

this is a failure that jeopardizes the success of our mission to Afghanistan and jeopardizes the very credibility of the Alliance.

Mr. Speaker, we often say that failure is not an option. Alas, in Afghanistan failure is a distinct possibility, and unless allied leaders in the next few weeks demonstrate the political will to deploy the necessary assets in Afghanistan, failure gradually will become a reality.

Two weeks ago, this Member returned from the NATO Parliamentary Assembly meeting in Bratislava. Recognizing the gravity of the situation in Afghanistan, the leaders of the 26 national delegations—in an unprecedented action—authorized this Member, as the President of the Assembly, to send a letter to our national leaders, expressing the concern of the Assembly and urging governments to provide the necessary resources for ISAF.

Mr. Speaker, this Member will also raise these concerns with those national leaders in an address to the Istanbul Summit later this month. Likewise, the Bush Administration at Istanbul must press our allies to dig deep and find the extra personnel and resources that are needed to make this mission a success.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

SMART SECURITY

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, no one disagrees that to keep our country secure, we must become independent of foreign fuels, while at the same time we must control the rising energy costs here in our country. Where the disagreement arises is how this should be done.

Today, the House leadership brought up four energy bills in an attempt to look like they are addressing our energy needs. From rehashing a bill that already passed the House not once but twice, that focuses on huge giveaways to big oil and gas companies to a bill that would open up drilling in the arctic refuge, this is nothing more than a sham. None of these bills do anything to promote an energy policy that will keep us secure from terrorism and ensure that our energy needs are met. In fact, opening up the arctic refuge to drilling would increase global oil reserves by only .31 percent. That is right, only 31/100ths of 1 percent. That is less oil than the United States consumes in 6 months.

There has to be a better way, a more intelligent way, a way not rooted in ruthless expediency, but in the values that we hold dear. And there is. I have introduced legislation to create a SMART security platform for the 21st century. SMART stands for Sensible

Multilateral American Response to Terrorism. One of the components of SMART is a real strategy for energy independence, especially support for the development of renewable energy sources. Nothing threatens national security more than reliance on Middle Eastern oil.

This reliance cannot be met with drilling in the arctic refuge or with giveaways to big oil and gas companies. We must invest in renewable energy and in conservation. We must increase energy efficiency. Only through decreased dependence on oil will we make ourselves more secure.

Along with decreasing our dependence on foreign oil, we must stop the spread of weapons of mass destruction. Keeping the American people safe must be our highest priority. On that point the President and I agree, but we must avoid equating our security with aggression and military force. Just because one has a hammer, not every problem is a nail. The United States possesses the world's largest hammer in the form of its mighty military, but some situations require a more delicate touch. SMART security calls for aggressive diplomacy, a commitment to nuclear nonproliferation, strong regional security arrangements, and vigorous inspection regimes. The United States must set an example for the rest of the world by renouncing the first use of nuclear weapons and the development of new nuclear weapons.

We must maintain our commitment to existing international treaties like the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, the Biological Weapons Convention, and the Chemical Weapons Convention. We must support and adequately fund programs like the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program, which works with the Russian Federation and the states of the former Soviet Union to dismantle nuclear warheads, reduce nuclear stockpiles, and secure nuclear weapons in Russia. And we must replicate these programs in other troubled regions like North Korea and Iran.

Not every country will proactively choose to give up its nuclear program, and we can provide the incentives if we choose. In the long run, negotiating with other countries will keep us much safer than thinking that we can scare them into submission.

The Bush doctrine has been tried. It has failed. It is time for a new national security strategy. SMART security defends America by relying on the very best of America, our commitment to peace, our commitment to freedom, our compassion for the people of the world, and our capacity for multilateral leadership. SMART security is tough, it is pragmatic, and it is patriotic. SMART security is smart, and it will keep America safe.

HUMAN EMBRYO STEM CELL RESEARCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, many people have probably seen the recent news coverage about Nancy Reagan's hope to see more funding go to human embryo stem cell research in the hopes of finding a cure for Alzheimer's disease. Indeed, recently Newsweek ran a cover story on this issue.

I am a physician, and I used to care for many patients with Alzheimer's disease, and I know first hand the anguish it causes to lose a loved one or to have a family member with this condition. I have three concerns that I would like to raise about this debate.

First of all, I am concerned that advocates for this embryo stem cell research are unethically playing on the emotions of millions of Americans. Of all the conditions that have been proposed as possibly treatable with stem cells, whether embryonic or adult stem cells, Alzheimer's disease is one of the least likely where stem cells could be useful.

I say this because on autopsy, the brains on Alzheimer's disease patients do not show a pure dropout of neurons. If it was a loss of normal nerve cells, cell therapy might have potential. The fact is the brains of Alzheimer's disease patients typically contain lesions called senile plaques and neurofibrillary tangles. The plaques, which accumulate on the outside of neurons, consist mainly of deposits of a protein called beta-amyloid. Chemical and cellular markers of inflammation are also present.

We need to find out what causes these plaques and how we can prevent them. It is not clear at all if the problem with Alzheimer's disease is treatable with cell replacement therapy. Most experts I have contacted feel that the more promising solution will be early detection, very early detection, and medication to prevent progression and not cell replacement therapy.

Secondly, I am quite concerned that people are being falsely led to believe that it is only embryo stem cells that might have potential here.

Mr. Speaker, the following diseases have been successfully treated with adult stem cells from humans: Parkinson's disease, blindness has been treated, relief of symptom of lupus, multiple sclerosis, and rheumatoid arthritis; the cure of combined immunodeficiency diseases, the treatment of several different types of leukemia, solid tumors, neuroblastomas, non-Hodgkin's lymphomas, multiple sclerosis. Indeed, the list goes on and on.

□ 1730

However, there have been no successful treatments of any humans with embryo stem cells, and, as I have said repeatedly on this floor, they do not have an animal model of successfully treating an animal with embryo stem cells. Indeed, it is unclear if they will ever have clinical usefulness.