

□ 1815

President Roosevelt thought of a GI bill, thought how to build America after the war. This President has eliminated and canceled vocational training programs and cut Pell grants, as well as President Johnson, during the days of the Vietnam signed into law the Medicaid legislation. This President's budget cuts \$10 billion from Medicaid. All this because we are sagged down having added in the last 4½ years a little over \$2 trillion to the Nation's debt. Our dreams for America are limited now, and literally weighed down by a Nation, by a debt that has been accumulated over the years that we cannot see an America with not only an interstate highway system, but we should have a broadband system for all of America to move it electronically forward into the future. It is the debt that is weighing us down and this, unlike in past military victories, this country has not seen the victory overseas to bring it home and make sure that all of America is also victorious.

FUELS SECURITY ACT

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

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I did not come here to speak about Iraq. I have been there three times and the last time was 3 weeks ago. And each time I have been very impressed by the morale and the attitude of our soldiers, and they consistently have asked me to do this. They said, you know, we see two wars. We see the one that is being fought on CNN, and that is true. That is a reality, the bombings. But we also see the war that we are fighting. Would you please occasionally go home and tell people about the good things that are happening in education and health care, economy and so on. And so it is a tough deal. It is tough. And yet there are some good things that are happening.

The reason I came over here tonight to speak was about the Fuels Security Act, which has been introduced by the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Ms. HERSETH), the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON).

As almost everyone in our country is aware, we have really suffered from high fuel prices over the last several months. And this has probably been the greatest drag we could possibly have on our economy at the present time. We are now nearly 60 percent dependent on foreign oil. And OPEC can influence the price of fuel here dramatically by either loosening or tightening their fuel supply. We recently saw that with our negotiations with Saudi Arabia. And so this is a very uncomfortable position for this country to be in.

An alternative to foreign oil is ethanol and biodiesel. Currently, 10 per-

cent ethanol blends are roughly 10 to 15 cents a gallon cheaper at the pump than regular gasoline. We find that E 85, which is 85 percent ethanol, is 60 to 70 cents a gallon cheaper. So in my State, Nebraska, E 85 has been selling for about \$1.60 a gallon, where other fuels have been \$2.20 and \$2.30.

Currently, 20 States produce ethanol, and that would include California and Kentucky, States that at one time we assumed would never be in the ethanol business. And as many people know, ethanol can be produced from biomass, even certain types of garbage. And I think eventually all 50 States probably will have some type of ethanol production of one kind or another.

In 2004 we produced 3.6 billion gallons of ethanol. This year, 2005, we will hit roughly 4.5 billion gallons. And the reason I am here tonight is that I want to make clear that people understand that the renewable fuel standard in the energy bill passed by the House and now sent over to the other body mandates that we go to 5 billion gallons of ethanol production by the year 2012. Well, we are going to be over 5 billion gallons next year, in 2006. And that is why we have introduced the Fuels Security Act. The Fuels Security Act proposes that we raise the ethanol allotment from 5 billion gallons to 8 billion gallons by 2012.

Increasing ethanol production will have several positive consequences and effects on the economy. Number one, it will lower the price of gasoline. Currently, the ethanol industry that we have in place today lowers the average price of a gallon of gasoline by 29 cents. So if somebody has been paying \$2.20 at the pump, they would be paying about \$2.50 if we took ethanol out of the picture.

Ethanol production raises the price of a bushel of corn by about 30 to 40 cents a bushel. As corn prices increase, farm payments decline. It is a countercyclical effect. And so ethanol reduces the cost of the farm bill by an estimated \$5.9 billion over 10 years, which will certainly be a benefit to the taxpayer. It will add \$51 billion to farm income over 10 years. It will reduce the trade deficit by \$64 billion between 2005 and 2012. And everyone knows that we are suffering from a very disadvantageous trade deficit at the present time.

We will add 243,000 jobs to our economy and reduce greenhouse gases by 7 million tons a year. So we think that biodiesel and ethanol is a very viable alternative. It reduces our dependence on foreign oil. And we would hope that the other body would consider including the Fuels Security Act in conference when and if they get the energy bill passed.

ABUSES OF POWER LOBBYING REFORM

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, absolute power corrupts, and over the last decade, the cozy relationships that have been created between House Republicans and powerful corporate lobbyists have led to lobbyists controlling what happens here on the House floor.

Earlier this year, the Republican majority rammed through weaker ethics rules to protect one of their leaders who has come under scrutiny because of his relationship with a lobbyist. Fortunately, the American people were not fooled by this stunt. They saw the new rules for what they were, nothing more than an attempt to protect a powerful Republican leader. Finally, after media and public outcry became too much for the Republican majority to endure, Republicans agreed to reinstate the old bipartisan ethics rules.

However, Mr. Speaker, it is important to remember that had the public been indifferent and had the Democrats on the Ethics Committee gone ahead and allowed the committee to organize under the weakened rules, today this House would be structured under ethics rules that would allow either side, Democrat or Republican, to shield its Members from scrutiny. Mr. Speaker, the Republican ethics reversal was good for this institution and good for the American public.

I wanted to say, though, Mr. Speaker, that lobbyists still have too much power within the Republican majority here on Capitol Hill. House Republicans turned to lobbyists from the pharmaceutical industry to write a prescription drug law that does nothing to help senior citizens with the skyrocketing prices of their prescriptions drugs. Republicans turned to lobbyists from the oil and gas industry to write an energy bill that does nothing to address the rising costs Americans pay at the pump. With each of these bills rewarding lobbyists with billions of dollars in tax breaks and government handouts, Republicans did absolutely nothing to help out middle-class Americans who continue to struggle to make ends meet.

I think it is time Congress rein in the power of Washington lobbyists. Last week the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) introduced legislation that would dramatically reform the way lobbyists do business in this town. The reform legislation would force lobbyists to publicly disclose who they meet, whether it is a Member of Congress or an administration official, and what issue they are lobbying about. If the news reports of the last 4 months have shown anything, it is that lobbyists work below the radar screen here in Washington, and it is time for that to change and this reform legislation to get a good start.

The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) want to bring a Republican on board to make their reform legislation bipartisan, but so far

they have no takers. In fact, when the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the majority leader, was asked about the reform legislation last week, his first response was to simply laugh. And then the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) responded, and I am quoting, "I am not interested in the water that they are carrying for some of these leftist groups."

Now, I would maintain that lobbying reform should not be a partisan issue. The majority leader should not stand in the way of any Republican who decides to sign on to the Meehan-Emanuel bill.

And could it be that the Republican leadership has become so cozy with Washington lobbyists that they do not want to see any lobbyist reform?

Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) said right here on the House floor, and I am quoting, "The time has come that the American people know exactly what their representatives are doing here in Washington . . . are they feeding at the public trough, taking lobbyist paid vacations, getting wined and dined by special interests? Or are they working hard to represent their constituents? The people, the American people have a right to know."

Now, that is what the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) said, as I said, 10 years ago. But, Mr. Speaker, what has happened to the majority leader over the last 10 years that makes him sing a different tune today?

I think it is time this House support real lobbying reform, and it is time House Republicans seriously look at the ideas that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) have put forward in their legislation.

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

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

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

SCIENTIFIC MODEL FOR DECISION-MAKING

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address

the House this evening and talk about an issue that is not Republican; it is not Democrat. It is an issue that may potentially affect every single citizen in our Nation.

When I ran for office as a physician, many folks in my district and in my family and in my practice asked me why? What on Earth do you want do that for? Why would a physician run for office?

Well, in addition to the feelings that most of us had, I suspect, about making a real difference, one of the things that attracted me to being a public servant, running for office, was the opportunity to bring the scientific model to decision-making in the world of public policy. As a physician, I was trained in the scientific model.

And what is that? That means that when you have a problem before you, like a patient who has a disease that you do not know about, that you work as hard as you can to identify that problem, and then you gain as much information about that problem as possible. And then you define specific solutions for the problem, and then you enact one of those solutions. You enact one of those treatment plans, if you will, and you measure the result, see where you are; and if you are not where you need to be, then you change what you are doing and move on so that you make modifications that are necessary so that you work toward that end goal.

Now, this is a classic model for doing all that is necessary and not more. It also allows for the greatest amount of critical thinking about any issue, not just scientific issues, but any issue; and if it is followed, it will result in the best outcome.

Now, the opportunity to bring this type of decision-making, what I call solution-making, to Congress is truly a great privilege. For if we do not address problems in this manner, then we are left with political battles where the argument that carries the day goes to the group with the most and greatest number of troops on their side, or with the side that has the most passion or the most emotion in their argument.

Now, there is nothing wrong with numbers, and there is nothing wrong with passion, and there is nothing wrong with emotion. It is just that they may not get you to the right solution.

And such is the case, I believe, with the issue of stem cell research. What is the problem? What is the problem that we are trying to address with stem cell research? Well, it is diseases. Patients have diseases and stem cells may be able to cure some of those diseases.

Stem cells are cells that when they are stimulated or encouraged, they may become other kinds of cells, many of which may be beneficial in the treatment of diseases.

And there are basically three types of stem cells. There are embryonic stem cells, those cells that come from an embryo, a human before it is born. There are cord or placental cells, those

cells that are left over after the birth of a baby. And then there adult stem cells; and those cells, in spite of the fact that they are called adult, come from anybody that has been born.

Now, regardless of where you come down on this matter, which cells ought to be used, I think it can be said that no one can state that this issue is not full of ethical dilemmas. The beauty of this issue is that science, if you follow the science, we can avoid those ethical challenges. And the bonus is that they work.

If you take a peek at this poster here, what we have are adult stem cells. And there are all sorts of different adult stem cells. There are bone marrow and peripheral blood and hair and cells from your stomach or your GI tract or the placenta or the brain. All of those can result in a different kind of cell. You can get tendon from bone marrow. You can get nerves from peripheral blood cells. You can get heart cells from skeletal muscle cells. All of these kind of cells are available.

In addition to that, the adult stem cells that have been used and studied have actually shown great benefit in many different diseases, unlike embryonic cells to date. Adult stem cells have treated 43 different types of diseases from brain cancer to myasthenia gravis to stroke. So they work. A couple of examples, Parkinson's patient treated with his own adult stem cell continues to exhibit relief from 80 percent of his symptoms more than 6 years after his surgery. A phase 1 human clinical trial using this therapy is currently under way.

□ 1830

Umbilical cord cells were used to treat a South Korean woman who had been paralyzed, a spinal cord injury. She now is able to walk.

Dr. Denise Faustman, a leading diabetes researcher from Harvard has completely reversed end-stage juvenile diabetes in mice and has FDA approval to begin human clinical trials.

As we go through this discussion over the next number of weeks and months and years, frankly, I urge my colleagues to look anew, to look objectively at the issue of stem cell research. If we do, I believe that we can then all determine that we will work in a reasoned manner together to allow scientists and researchers to help the patients of our Nation.

A FREE AMERICAN

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, last night, the House passed House Resolution 193 as a suspension bill. For people who may not know, suspension bills are meant to be noncontroversial measures the House typically passes unanimously.