

though we are barely 10 days out of London. There was, as we stood here this morning, a moment in solidarity with those who died in London.

Madam Speaker, WMATA, our own Metro system here, is considerably ahead of most of the country. In fact, WMATA is designated as the lead agency for emergency coordination for the entire region's transit and commuter rail. We are ahead of most of the country, after Oklahoma City began to take real action that most still have not begun to take. In June, 19 million people rode WMATA. That breaks all of its records. Many of those were constituents of the Members of this House and the Senate, because 20 million visitors come annually to the District of Columbia.

WMATA indicates that its most pressing needs are current WMD detection equipment, decontamination equipment and testing, surveillance systems, antiterror equipment for transit police, video cameras for buses. Remember, this is one of the best prepared systems in the country.

Yet, Madam Speaker, yesterday, Democratic Leader PELOSI, Ranking Member THOMPSON of the Committee on Homeland Security, and other Democratic leaders stood with me as I reintroduced the Secure Trains Act, an act I first introduced more than a year ago, simply to bring the country somewhere approaching where we have now, for some time, been in aviation, having gotten there for aviation after the fact.

We are breaking the post-9/11 promise that we would never be caught flat-footed again. In fact, the President's 2006 budget eliminated dedicated mass transportation funding all together. I trust that we will put it back, or something back, before we go on August recess. Ninety percent of the funds that we have allocated have been for aviation security. Yet 9 billion passenger trips are made annually on rail and on public transportation. What are we thinking?

This bill, a modest \$3.8 billion for the basics: cameras, communications systems, explosive detection, security upgrades on tracks and tunnels. Is this too much to ask? More than 4 years after 9/11, is this too much to ask, following more than 50 dead in London, almost 200 dead in Madrid, hundreds injured when you tally them both together?

Mr. Chertoff allowed as how \$8.6 billion was "available for transit operators" under one of the homeland security programs. What he was talking about, Madam Speaker, is that a local jurisdiction can use transit for transit security money, money that we have allocated for first responders. I do not believe we mean transit security to be the stepchild of homeland security when that is where the people are. Far more people than ever consider getting on an airplane, and we are borrowing from first responders who are screaming that they do not have enough funds in order to skim off money for rail

transportation, after Madrid, after London, and after a terrible accident involving HAZMAT in South Carolina, which could just as easily have been a terrorist event.

I beg the House, before we go on August recess, to do our duty, keep our post-9/11 promise to do what is necessary for passenger rail, light rail, ferries, buses, the vehicles, the public transportation that our people get on every day to go to and from work. There is still time to do it. I do not think we would want to go home when every single Member will have a question like this: What have you done for our subways? What have you done for our buses? We do not need to go home and say "nothing," Madam Speaker.

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

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. GINGREY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my Special Order at this time.

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

There was no objection.

STEM CELL RESEARCH

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

Mr. GINGREY. Madam Speaker, I rise to address the matter of stem cell research, in light of the emergence of viable alternatives that would continue scientific discovery while respecting human life in all forms and in all stages.

I also rise today as a proud cosponsor of H.R. 3144, the Respect For Life Pluripotent Stem Cell Act of 2005. I further would like to thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) for not only his steadfast commitment to scientific advancement, but also his steadfast commitment to defending the sanctity of human life.

In a debate that has been dominated by an it-is-the-only-way approach, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) has introduced a solution that could achieve the same objective as the Castle-DeGette bill, while preserving human life at its most vulnerable stage.

Madam Speaker, I recognize that people of goodwill can disagree on the matter of when human life begins. However, no one can dispute that an embryo is at least potential life; and many people, my physician self included, believe an embryo to be a liv-

ing human being, fully vested with the rights that we all enjoy. Therefore, even if someone only believes an embryo to be a potential life, they should support the Bartlett bill because it accomplishes, Madam Speaker, the same ends as the Castle-DeGette bill, while giving the benefit of doubt and erring on the side of human life.

Having practiced for nearly 30 years as a pro-life OB-GYN, I cosponsored the Bartlett bill, because it represents the most moral and judicious solution to the stem cell research debate.

Madam Speaker, the Bartlett bill would provide funding to the NIH, the National Institutes of Health, \$15 million for the creation of a research program focused on perfecting the necessary techniques to extract stem cells from an embryo without, let me repeat, without harming the embryo in any way, shape, or form. This bill further acts in a responsible manner by mandating that no human embryos be harmed or destroyed, even in the initial perfection of the technique, for the research will be done on nonhuman primates.

The Bartlett bill represents an acceptable compromise to most Americans, because they would like to see scientific advancement to cure diseases such as Type 1 diabetes, Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, spinal cord injury, while making sure human life is never exploited or harmed in the process.

Madam Speaker, I am also very pleased to see that Majority Leader FRIST has decided to shepherd a similar bill in the Senate. This marks an important step in advancing morally sound and acceptable stem cell research. This Congress truly has an incredible opportunity to send to the President's desk a stem cell research bill that respects human life and supports scientific advancement.

I would again like to thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) for taking the lead on this issue and for finding an acceptable and moral solution. I also extend my gratitude to Senator FRIST for his efforts to advance this bill in the Senate. I encourage all of my colleagues, both Democrat and Republican, both pro-life and pro-choice, to take a good hard look at the Bartlett bill. I think they will see that it is the best option to fight disease and find cures in a responsible manner.

This marks an opportunity for this Congress to put partisanship aside and just do the right thing. Madam Speaker, the American people expect no less of us.

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

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my Special Order at this time.

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

There was no objection.

THE RAVAGES OF WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, today I speak about the ravages of war. I also say to my colleagues that there is no claim of being unpatriotic when you desire to speak of peace. The ravages of war can generate much devastation, not only in our domestic society, but also internationally.

I rise today, first of all, to pay tribute to a young man who lived in my community who was buried today, a young officer in the United States military, enlisted personnel, young and bright and committed to serving his country. In actuality, he died serving his country.

□ 1545

Mr. Speaker, it was not by the ordinary manner in which you might have thought he may have lost his life, he did not suffer a wound, but he was a casualty of war.

For he was sent into Iraq already ailing, but because of the need for the recruiting numbers and the necessity of meeting quotas, he was sent to Iraq. And he served ably.

But he was carried out on a stretcher, because, unfortunately, he suffered liver failure. No matter how our young men and women, enlisted personnel, Reservists and National Guard lose their life in the line of battle, we owe them a great debt of gratitude. And so to his mother today as she buried her son, I offered to her my deepest sympathy.

Unfortunately, things do not work a lot of times when we think of the way our government should, and that is why I account or say that this is part of the ravages of war. The hospital system failed Nathaniel Parker, from the hospital system, the military system, the veterans system failed him, maybe because they had a billion dollar shortfall.

But when he went to the hospital to receive treatment, he was turned away. I will not allow that to stand, because I will be taking his case and calling for an investigation, because I do not want one single soldier to come home and face the doors of the hospitals being shut in their face.

The ravages of war also find that children are being killed. How sad it is to find that soldiers who simply wanted to engage children in Iraq were the cause or the genesis of children, because of a horrible suicide bomber, an evil person, yes, but because of the ex-

istence of our military there and the children coming to them to receive candy, much of what I have seen when I visited the soldiers, because they care and they love, the soldiers were endangered, the children were endangered, and we saw the killing of children in Iraq, the ravages of war.

And then of course in the last 24 hours, the Green Zone that is supposed to be safe, the very place that I slept while I was in Iraq, had two explosions. So that means that our command and our soldiers that come there for comfort, our contractors are not safe. The ravages of war. The explosions in the Green Zone.

There is no safety in Iraq. And then when you talk to the Iraqi people, they say, We have no running water, we have no electricity, we cannot send our children to school. Meeting with women there, they said that they are in fear of their lives, and their children cannot go to school.

There is no solution that seems to be to bring about peace. And then, of course, there is discussion of whether or not our military should be inside Iraq or really at the borders to stop the insurgents or those who come to do the terrorists acts from coming inside into the country.

Most importantly, as we give the deepest sympathy to our friends in London, England, we offer to our prayers to their families. We realize that the terrorism was not one that came inside, it existed inside the country, and we realize that that terrorism is what we should be focused on, and the fact that Iraq continues to churn in the minds of those who think that we are not the great Nation that we are, it continues to foster in the minds of those that they should do evil things.

And so it is important for the President and this administration to set a timeline, not a date certain, but a timeline to bring our troops home. For the families who are now distraught, the Reservists and the National Guard families who cannot make ends meet, and, of course, for a war that is churning in the minds of those who believe that that is all that America represents, it churns, it permeates, it sours, and it turns into evil acts.

It is important for this Nation to stand up and acknowledge that Iraq must take the leadership of its own country. We might be able to stay on the border, but the constant jeopardy of our young men and women on the front lines, not because they are not brave, not because they are not courageous, because we have no plan, we have no solution, and they become targets of evilness, the children become targets of evilness because we represent a certain force in Iraq.

The war was based upon misdirection and untruth, and so it is hard to be able to be liberators when there are no weapons of mass destruction. I would simply argue that we must come together, and I am delighted to be on the bipartisan legislation that speaks about an orderly timeline.

And I hope if we ever take this country to war again, whatever president it may be, Democratic or Republican, that we will do so with a constitutional vote under the Constitution, because we recognize when America is at war, we come together as one, we support our troops.

But the way that we go to war is the key. And victory will come to those who understand process and understand plan and understand solution and understand exit strategies, success strategies.

And so, Madam Speaker, I think it is important, as I pay tribute to Nathaniel Parker who was buried today, a young soldier who served his country in Iraq, that we say to the Nathaniel Parkers whose medical system here in the United States failed him, not on our clock, not on our watch will this ever happen again, not at Abu Ghraib, or not the tragedies of loss of life, not anything that spoils the Democratic thrust of America. It will not be on our clock. And I ask my colleagues to work with us to bring our troops home.

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Miss MCMORRIS). The Chair would just remind persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House, and it is not appropriate to show any signs of approval or disapproval of the proceedings.

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

(Ms. FOXX addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

GOOD NEWS ABOUT AMERICA'S ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the Majority Leader.

Mr. TIAHRT. Madam Speaker, I plan on spending most of the next hour