

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.

I voted no. Let me tell you why. Because it was a protest vote meant to encourage freedom and liberty for all Americans. Let us start with what it said.

H.R. 193 is a resolution that says in part, "expressing support to the organizers and participants of the historic meeting of the Assembly to Promote the Civil Society in Cuba on 20 May 2005 in Havana. Whereas, Fidel Castro's terrorist regime has continued to repress all attempts by Cuban people to bring democratic change to Cuba and denies universally recognized liberties, including freedom of speech, association, movement and the press."

I could go on but there is no need to. It is all right there in what I just read. We deny liberties denied Cubans while a Cuban-American in my city of Seattle is denied the right to go to Cuba to visit his son by the U.S. government.

Remember the grandstanding on Elian Gonzales? We wag our fingers at Fidel and shout about Cubans being denied liberty at every moment. Well, we are denying the right of an American to travel to Cuba for a few days to see his son. How hypocritical is that?

I am talking about the plight of Sergeant Carlos Lazo. He came to America from Cuba in the early 1990s floating on a raft in the ocean. He risked his life for a chance to come here. Talk about the quintessential story about risking everything to call America home. Carlos Lazo is the stuff of books and movies and news coverage. He wants none of it. He just wants to see his children in Cuba. And the United States government will not let him go.

Floating on the raft in the ocean, that is what Carlos Lazo did. That is about as courageous as it gets. So he arrives in America. He moves to the State of Washington. A man grateful to be alive, he determines to embrace his new country and do everything within his power to give back. He joins the Washington National Guard. Over a year ago, his unit dispatched to Iraq. Now Carlos serves his country in one of the most dangerous places in Iraq, Fallujah, as a medic. He serves on the ground in Iraq for a year.

When his duty is over, Carlos wants to go see his kids still in Cuba. Carlos goes to Miami, but he is denied the right to travel to Cuba. He is denied the right to board an airplane bound for Havana. He saw them in 2003, and he is told by the government: You cannot see them again until 2006. Three years.

Sergeant Lazo, who proudly served America, who risked his life to get here and risked his life to defend liberty, is now a man whose liberty has been denied. He cannot see his children in Cuba until the President lets him go.

When will Carlos be able to visit his children in Cuba? I ask that the Speaker, because the administration is in denial, call the White House. They want to perpetuate a bureaucracy and a failed policy, not assist an American

who wants the sum total of what every parent wants, the right to see their kids.

The government has in place a policy which denies the basic liberties of an American hero, and we have not lifted one finger in this House to help Carlos Lazo. The Secretary of Defense is not interested in him. The White House is not interested in its citizen. The White House and this House are only interested in wagging fingers at Fidel Castro.

Carlos Lazo is a man who embodies everything Americans stand for, courage, determination, quiet thanks from a man grateful to have made a new life and a new home. And now Carlos is a man who cannot be united with his family. Carlos is a man who did not want to be anything but a quiet, grateful American and is forced to become a man in the spotlight, hoping someone will pay attention, hoping someone will let him see his kids.

H. Res. 193 is a suspension bill that would have us suspend disbelief. Carlos deserves the thanks of a grateful Nation and the immediate assistance of this administration and the Congress. We ought to add his name to H. Res. 193 so he can travel. We should do that and make a resolve that the United States of America, which sees itself as a beacon of liberty in the world, extend its support to Carlos Lazo and will facilitate his immediate travel to Cuba to be reunited with his kids.

Anything less than fighting and defending the liberty of Carlos Lazo from the State of Washington is the work of a Congress long on hyperbole and short on action in defense of liberty.

Mr. Speaker, call the Secretary of Defense before the day is out. I bet he is still in his office. Send Carlos Lazo to Cuba, to his sons in his former homeland, so he can be a free American.

If you want to make a real statement about what it means to be free, let one American be free, free to travel, free to be reunited with his children, free to show the people of Cuba, firsthand, what freedom means in this country.

Free to show Cubans firsthand that America does not have to prevent its citizens from leaving the country in order to keep them.

Mr. Speaker, use your office to intercede and let this House stand as a beacon of freedom and liberty for every American, not just some Americans.

So long as Carlos Lazo is forbidden from visiting his children in Cuba, America can only be known as the land where some are truly free and others are truly denied liberty.

Send Carlos Lazo to Cuba.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) is recognized for 5 minutes. (Mr. MCHENRY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

SUPPORTING LT. PANTANO

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

tleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken at great lengths now about Second Lieutenant Ilario Pantano, a Marine who served our Nation bravely in both Gulf Wars and who now stands accused of murder for defending himself and this country.

Lt. Pantano's article 32 hearing ended 2 weeks ago, and now the investigating officer in the case, Major Mark Winn, is set to make his recommendation on the case to the Second Marine Division Commander, General Richard Huck, by Friday.

I stand here today to represent the thousands of people who have joined in my hope and prayers that, on Friday, Major Winn will recommend that all charges be dropped against Lt. Pantano.

Based on the facts of the case, the man who brought forth the allegations, Sergeant Coburn, is someone who did not see the shooting and who waited 2½ months to report the incident. I am convinced that this lieutenant should and will be exonerated of all charges.

I know that, during the hearing, both his Marine and civilian attorneys did an excellent job of proving the innocence of Lt. Pantano, and I have the utmost confidence in the system that the truth will prevail.

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly believe that Lt. Pantano was doing his job when he found himself in an unfortunate situation where he needed to defend himself and his platoon members against the enemy.

Having met and interacted with Lt. Pantano and his family over the past few months, I have had the opportunity to get to know them well. I am certain that the man I have come to know is not a murderer. He is a dedicated Marine who loves his Corps, his country and his family.

Mr. Speaker, I put in a resolution, House Resolution 167, to support Lt. Pantano as he faces trial. I continue to urge my colleagues in the House to take some time to read my resolution and look into this situation for themselves.

Lt. Pantano's mother also has a website that I encourage people to visit. The address is www.defendthedefenders.org. I would like to repeat that, www.defendthedefenders.org.

Mr. Speaker, I close once again by asking that we do not send the wrong message to our men and women in uniform and cause them to second guess their decisions. I fear that instilling doubt into the minds of our Nation's defenders places their lives and the security of our Nation in jeopardy.

Mr. Speaker, I close by asking God to please bless Lt. Pantano and his family, and hopefully, on Friday, this decision will be to exonerate this wonderful lieutenant who loves his country. I also ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform and their families. I close by asking God to please bless America.