

research in order to receive federal funds for umbilical cord stem cell research!

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that H.R. 810 violates basic constitutional principles by forcing taxpayers to subsidize embryonic stem cell research. However, H.R. 2520 also exceeds Congress's constitutional authority and may even retard effective adult stem cell research. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote against both H.R. 810 and H.R. 2520.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2520, an act that will provide for a nationwide umbilical stem cell transplantation system. Not only does the implementation of such a system pave the way for numerous potentially life saving medical advances, but it builds on an area of study that has a demonstrated track record of success. Additionally, this legislation reauthorizes the national bone marrow transplant system, which has been a great success.

The Twenty-First Century witnessed many great scientific achievements and medical advances. These advances have helped to cure or mitigate against a number of formerly terminal conditions and diseases. One can only imagine the possibilities that modern technology and modern research offer, which will yield even greater achievements in the near and distant future. However, we must also be cognizant of ethical standards to ensure that new technology does not compete with the moral standards of our society. H.R. 2520 is a good start.

Studies have demonstrated that stem cells found in umbilical cords may be used to regenerate human nerve, blood, cartilage, skin and muscle cells. Research also demonstrates that conditions such as leukemia and sickle cell disease could be cured by more advanced umbilical cord stem cell research. Cord blood cells are already being used to treat over 67 diseases. We need to support this research, and creating a nationwide umbilical stem cell transplantation system is an important first step to providing scientists with the resources they need to make advances in this field of study. This database can also be used to allow potential donors to patients in need of various types of transplants.

H.R. 2520 provides a vehicle for promoting and enhancing promising scientific research in the field of umbilical stem cell transplantation. It certainly meets the highest standards of bioethics and has a track record of scientific evidence suggesting that investing taxpayer resources to promote this field of study will result in positive dividends for the health of our communities. I strongly support H.R. 2520, and I encourage my colleagues to vote yes for this important legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. 2520.

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. SMITH of New Jersey. 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.

STEM CELL RESEARCH ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2005

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of Monday, May 23, 2005, I call up the bill (H.R. 810) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for human embryonic stem cell research, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of H.R. 810 is as follows:

H.R. 810

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act of 2005".

SEC. 2. HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELL RESEARCH.

Part H of title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 289 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 498C the following:

"SEC. 498D. HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELL RESEARCH.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law (including any regulation or guidance), the Secretary shall conduct and support research that utilizes human embryonic stem cells in accordance with this section (regardless of the date on which the stem cells were derived from a human embryo).

"(b) ETHICAL REQUIREMENTS.—Human embryonic stem cells shall be eligible for use in any research conducted or supported by the Secretary if the cells meet each of the following:

"(1) The stem cells were derived from human embryos that have been donated from in vitro fertilization clinics, were created for the purposes of fertility treatment, and were in excess of the clinical need of the individuals seeking such treatment.

"(2) Prior to the consideration of embryo donation and through consultation with the individuals seeking fertility treatment, it was determined that the embryos would never be implanted in a woman and would otherwise be discarded.

"(3) The individuals seeking fertility treatment donated the embryos with written informed consent and without receiving any financial or other inducements to make the donation.

"(c) GUIDELINES.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary, in consultation with the Director of NIH, shall issue final guidelines to carry out this section.

"(d) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall annually prepare and submit to the appropriate committees of the Congress a report describing the activities carried out under this section during the preceding fiscal year, and including a description of whether and to what extent research under subsection (a) has been conducted in accordance with this section."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Monday, May 23, 2005, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. DEGETTE) each will control 1 hour and 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gen-

tleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) be given 45 minutes of the debate time on the pending bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) will control that time.

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) be allowed to control 20 minutes of the remaining 45 minutes that I currently have control over.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) will control that time.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on the pending bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

(Mr. BARTON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have a prepared statement I am going to put into the record on this bill, H.R. 810, but I am going to actually speak from the heart because I think that this is a very important issue.

Most of the issues that come before this body, there is an automatic position on. It may be the Republican position, the Democrat position, the Texas position, or it could be the committee position. And we come to the floor and we, almost by rote, say what is the particular position, and that is the way we vote.

But every now and then an issue comes up that is really an issue of conscience. It is an issue that deserves to be thoughtfully considered, debated, and decided on its own merit.

Now, there are many Members today that believe this particular issue is an issue that they feel so strongly about, on either side, that this is an easy issue for them, it is an automatic issue. They are going to be for it or against it for very valid reasons. But there are some of us, and I am in that camp today, that believe it is not an easy issue.

I come to the floor as a 100 percent lifetime voting member on prolife issues, minus one vote, in over 21 years. On all the votes that the prolife coalition at the State and Federal levels have scored as scorable votes, my record until this year was 100 percent, and I voted the wrong way on one issue so far this year from the prolife position. So that is not a bad record, 100 percent minus one. And after this vote today, I am going to be 100 percent minus two.

Why is that? Well, part of it is personal and part of it deals with tragedies in my family in the past. My father died of complications of diabetes at the age of 71. My brother, Jon Kevin Barton, died of liver cancer at the age of 44. My first granddaughter, Bryn Barton, died in the womb 2 days before delivery with complications of the umbilical cord, which had become crimped, and she was actually born dead.

Maybe the research we are debating today could not have helped any of those diseases or could not have helped my granddaughter, but maybe it could.

I am also going to vote for Castle-DeGette because of the future, not just the past. My wife Terri and I are expecting a baby in September, Jack Kevin Barton, named after her late father and my late brother, Jon Kevin Barton. He may come into this world with some disease. Hopefully not. I have three children that are already alive, Brad, Alison, and Kristin. I have two stepchildren, Lindsay and Cullen. I have three grandchildren that are living, Blake, Brent and Bailey Barton. Maybe they will live healthy, productive lives and they will never need some therapeutic breakthrough, but maybe they will. Maybe they will.

Now, we just voted for an expansion of cord blood and bone marrow research, which is a very, very good deal, and it deals with adult stem cells. And maybe the breakthrough is going to come in adult stem cells. I hope it does. I would love it. But maybe, just maybe, it is going to come because of embryonic stem cells.

Now, the President adopted a position in early 2001 that said the existing stem cell lines then in existence could be federally funded for research. They thought there were about 78 lines. It turned out that there were 22 they are using, there are 16 that are frozen, and there may be one or two more that might be used. But in any event, none of those lines that are currently allowed to be used for research purposes at the Federal level have been shown to have that breakthrough stem cell.

There are 200 adult cells in the body. The hope of stem cell research, whether it is adult or embryonic, is that we will find that one perfect cell that can be replicated into any of the other cells.

It is assumed, and it is an assumption, not a fact, that the plasticity of the embryonic cell is better and that there is a greater likelihood, although the research has only been done for the last 7 or 8 years, that there is a likelihood there might be a greater potential. And I want to emphasize might be.

So where I come down is, let us look at all the avenues.

□ 1345

We just voted for Smith-Barton-Young. Let us also vote for Castle-DeGette and look at all of our resources. That is why I am going to vote "yes."

Mr. Speaker, I rise to manage the time of debate on H.R. 810, legislation designed to expand the number of sources of embryonic stem cell lines that may be the subject of federally funded research. The bill is straightforward, yet the policy concerns surrounding this bill are anything but black and white. Before I yield time to my colleagues, I want to clarify a few of the following facts.

What the sponsors of this bill are trying to do is create enough lines of embryonic stem cells to allow basic scientific research to move forward. Many scientists believe that once we can identify a perfect, undifferentiated stem cell, it will lead to significant scientific breakthroughs and the discovery of cures for many diseases.

Currently, there are approximately 22 lines of embryonic stem cells that are available for federally funded research. This number is far below the estimated number of stem cell lines that were thought to exist in August of 2001, when the President announced his stem cell policy. When President Bush announced that Federal research dollars could be used for the first time on then existing stem cells, it was believed that there were at least 60 viable lines of stem cells that could be used for this research. For a variety of reasons, not all of these potential lines are now available for research.

We will also eventually need additional embryonic stem cell lines to make further scientific advances. In recent conversations with leading stem cell researchers, they indicated to me that all lines of embryonic stem cells eventually become exhausted. In order to produce clinical therapies, it is likely that researchers will also need more embryonic stem cell lines, of different genetic variations, than are presently eligible to receive Federal support.

In addition, the majority of the existing embryonic stem cell lines eligible for Federal support use mouse feeder cells, which will make it nearly impossible for these embryonic stem cell lines to be adopted in clinical use. For all of these reasons, researchers believe that the current number of embryonic stem cell lines will have to be increased.

It is difficult to take an ideologically pure position on this issue. President Bush recognized this on August 9, 2001. On recognizing the profound potential benefits of embryonic stem cell research, President Bush permitted for the first time Federal taxpayer dollars to be spent on embryonic stem cell research.

For my entire career in Congress, I have been a staunch defender of the culture of life and opposed all forms of abortion. At the same time, I believe we have an obligation to improve existing lives and do what we can to make them better in the future.

Today, on this difficult issue, Members will need to vote their consciences. My decision to support this bill was a difficult one, which I came to only after much personal struggle and reflection. My decision was shaped, in part, by the painful experiences of my own family. We lost my brother Jon in 2000, at the age of 44, after a long struggle with liver cancer. My father died after suffering from complications resulting from diabetes.

Let me tell you for a moment about my brother, Jon. He was younger than me. He and his wife, Jennifer, had two children, Jake and Jace. He was a State district judge in Texas. They told Jon he had liver cancer

when he was just 41 years old. We tried everything and, in fact, his cancer went into remission. The next year, it came back. Jon died in just three months short of his 44th birthday. I offered to give him part of my liver, but the doctors said he was too far-gone and it wouldn't work. That was five years ago. Jake is now 15, and Jace is 12. Every time I see them and their Mom, I think of Jon and wonder what stem cell research could have done for our family.

I cannot know the truth with absolute certainty, but my heart says that my brother and my father might be with me today if their doctors had access to treatments from stem cell research. Their lives were precious to me and to our family. I come to my decision on this vote because I believe in life, and in the future. If a vote today can save other families from losing brothers and fathers, my conscience will not permit any other decision.

I fully understand that some will say I am just wrong, or blinded by personal emotion. Many who disagree with me are my friends, and I completely respect their views and their advice. They are good people, and good people with the same facts sometimes come to different conclusions. Now, a few others will say that death is simply a part of life. No, it is not. I do not believe that we can ever accept that proposition without setting out on an extraordinary and dangerous path. Life is to be cherished and extended, and death is to be fought and never accepted.

My father and my brother died because illnesses took them. If I can do something to cure illness and thwart death for other families, I will because I must. Scientists believe that expanded embryonic stem cell research holds the potential to find cures for diseases like cancer or diabetes. It is my hope that supporting this bill will mean that many other American families will never have to endure the suffering and loss that my family went through. I believe that my obligation is to help advance science to make human life better now and in the future, in a manner that is consistent with Judeo-Christian ethics.

As we move forward with debate on this bill, my only request is that my colleagues try to respect one another and the deeply held beliefs on both sides of this very complex issue.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield 35 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK), and that he be allowed to yield that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORBES). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished and courageous gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

(Mr. LANGEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 810, and I want to acknowledge the bipartisan effort that has gone into this legislation and the incredible grass roots movement that has built support for this groundbreaking medical research. It

has been inspirational to see so many Members putting aside politics and partisanship to address this issue which affects the lives of millions of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I am one of those Americans. At age 16, I was an Explorer Scout in my hometown police station. One afternoon, in the police locker room, a gun accidentally discharged. The bullet severed my spinal cord, and I have been paralyzed ever since.

This experience shapes my perspective in so many ways. Above all, it has given me tremendous appreciation and respect for life. My life as a quadriplegic is filled with challenges and obstacles, yet I am grateful for every minute. This gratitude has become a passion, and it has motivated me to help create a culture that values and protects life from its beginning to its end.

To me, being pro-life also means fighting for policies that will eliminate pain and suffering and help people enjoy longer, healthier lives. And to me, support for embryonic stem cell research is entirely consistent with that position. What could be more life-affirming than using what otherwise would be discarded to save, extend, and improve countless lives?

This research offers the opportunity to discover cures and treatments for diseases like Parkinson's, Alzheimer's, ALS, diabetes, spinal cord injury, and many others. But it will take not only the talent of our scientists, but also the support of our government to realize its full potential. We have a responsibility to ensure that this research proceeds, and it does so with ethical safeguards and strict guidelines. By permitting research only on excess embryos created in the in-vitro fertilization process, and by establishing a clear, voluntary consent process for donors, H.R. 810 meets this responsibility.

Stem cell research gives us hope and a reason to believe. I believe one day a child with diabetes will no longer face a lifetime of painful shots and tests. I believe one day families will no longer watch in agony as a loved one with Parkinson's or Alzheimer's gradually declines. And I believe one day I will walk again.

There are few moments in medical history when we can clearly identify a giant step forward in improving countless lives. We saw it with the discovery of antibiotics and the advent of organ transplants.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that adult and embryonic stem cell research is another of these great moments. Today we have a historic opportunity to make a difference in the lives of millions of Americans and for people around the world. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 810.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in respectful opposition to this sincerely conceived, but ill-founded, legislation known as Castle-DeGette, a bill that authorizes the use of Federal tax dollars to fund the destruction of human embryos for scientific research.

As we begin this debate, I am confident we will hear the supporters of this bill argue in the name of President Ronald Reagan, that somehow this research is consistent with his long-held views on the sanctity of life. But it was Ronald Reagan who wrote: "We cannot diminish the value of one category of human, the unborn, without diminishing the value of all human life."

The supporters will also argue that this is a debate between science and ideology, that destroying human embryos for research is necessary to cure a whole host of maladies, from spinal cord injuries to Parkinson's. But the facts suggest otherwise.

As Members will hear to date, embryonic stem cell research has not produced a single medical treatment, where ethical adult cell research has produced some 67 medical miracles. Physicians on our side of the aisle will make the case for the ethical alternative of adult stem cell research, and Congress today has already voted to greatly expand funding in this area.

But the debate over the legitimacy or the potential of embryonic stem cell research is actually not the point of this debate. We are here simply to decide whether Congress should take the taxpayer dollars of millions of pro-life Americans and use them to fund the destruction of human embryos for research. This debate is really not about whether embryonic stem cell research should be legal. Sadly, embryonic stem cell research is completely legal in this country and has been going on at universities and research facilities for years.

The proponents of this legislation do not just want to be able to do embryonic stem cell research. They want me to pay for it. And like 43 percent of the American people in a survey just out today, I have a problem with that.

You see, I believe that life begins at conception and that a human embryo is human life. I believe it is morally wrong to create human life to destroy it for research, and I further believe it is morally wrong to take the tax dollars of millions of pro-life Americans who believe, as I do, that human life is sacred, and use it to fund the destruction of human embryos for research.

This debate then is not really about what an embryo is. This debate is about who we are as a Nation, not will we respect the sanctity of life, but will we respect the deeply held moral beliefs of nearly half of the people of this Nation who find the destruction of human embryos for scientific research to be morally wrong.

Despite what is uttered in this debate today, I say again, this debate is not

about whether we should allow research. This debate is not about whether we should allow research that involves the destruction of human embryos. This debate is about who pays for it, and it is my fervent hope and prayer as we stand at this crossroads between science and the sanctity of life that we will choose life.

This morning on Capitol Hill I was surrounded by dozens of "snowflake babies," some 81 children who were born from frozen embryos, the throw-away material we will hear about today. As I spoke over the cries and cooing of those little fragile lives, I could not help but think of the ancient text: "I have set before you life and Earth, blessings and curses, now choose life so that you and your children may live."

Let this Congress choose life and reject Federal funding for the destruction of human embryos for research.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this debate we are having surrounding H.R. 810, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act, is really one of the most fundamentally important debates that this body can undertake. Regrettably, this discussion will only last a few hours on the floor of the House of Representatives today.

There have been no hearings on this bill or on the previous stem cell bill. H.R. 810 addresses the most fundamental, basic, ethical issue: life, and when does it begin; when should life, including human embryos, be open to experimentation and scientific research.

Those of us who believe in the sanctity of life from conception to our last breath, find the logic of the proponents of embryonic stem cell research flawed. H.R. 810 allows research and science to triumph philosophy and values.

This country seeks to be a world leader militarily, economically and scientifically, and culturally. But what about morally and ethically? What about leading the world in ethics and morals by declaring human life off limits to research and to manipulation through stem cell research? What about leading the world in ethics and morals by declaring human life from embryonic stage to old age as valued? We, as a Nation, believe that all life is precious and there is an ethical line that we as a people, as a Nation, will not cross.

We should lead by declaring that human life, even at the embryonic stage, is not open to manipulation, experimentation, or research. We cannot mask the efforts to manipulate human life under the guise of science or medical research.

You and I, each of us, we all share one thing in common: we were all embryos at one time. The embryos that were you and me were allowed to grow to become Congressmen, Congresswomen, police officers, factory workers, soldiers, government employees, lawyers, doctors, scientists. We were all embryos at one time. We were all

allowed to grow. Whether an embryo, a human life, is or is not allowed to grow, to become a unique individual, is a discussion this country really should have, a meaningful discussion, not just a few hours of debate in this Chamber.

It is my hope that families, individuals, couples and our children will have a discussion on human life and when it begins. Is an embryo life? At what point does an embryo become life? At what point does our Nation shelter life with the constitutional, legal, and governmental safeguards? Are there other ways to do promising medical and scientific research without destroying human embryos?

This is an ethical discussion I hoped would take place in the Halls of Congress, in the congressional committee rooms, in homes and workplaces all across America. Whether it is at the watercooler or in the cloakroom, these ethical and moral issues should and must be discussed as a Nation, as a people, as a culture, and as a world leader. Instead, this will only be discussed for a few hours on the House floor.

The other body has just gone through public, political, and senatorial debate on the use of a filibuster in our democracy. Because of this debate, a healthy discussion occurred in America. I, for one, do not wish to avoid the moral and ethical issues of stem cell research debate.

Yesterday in a news show, the commentator asked me why not allow stem cell research on discarded medical waste. Is that what we have come to, to viewing embryos, which if allowed to grow and divide would become human beings, being treated as medical waste? Why are proponents of H.R. 810 so adamant that we do research specifically using embryonic stem cells? According to the proponents of this legislation, these stem cells are our best hope of finding cures. They can develop into all cells of the body. They say medical science can unlock the keys to life. We can cure any disease or injury. They argue we must create life and then kill it to unlock the mysteries of life for scientific medical research.

Create and clone the building blocks of life so we can manipulate and experiment? Is that the line we wish to cross today? We will hear today about other research with adult stem cells, cord and placenta cells, bone marrow, fetal tissue, and unraveling our DNA through mapping of genome, all in the pursuit of finding medical cures for the dreaded diseases, illnesses, and injuries we all wish to cure. But where do we draw the line on medical research and say we as a Nation, we as a people will not cross that line? This question has not been adequately addressed in this legislation.

When do embryos become life? If you read the materials, after 40 hours, less than 2 days, the fertilized egg begins to divide and the embryos are checked after 40 hours. Or is it 5 days when embryos are called blastocysts? At this

stage there are approximately 250 cells. Or do we allow the blastocysts to survive in a laboratory culture for up to 14 days and still not call them human life but blastocysts so they are still open to research and experimentation?

□ 1400

When does life become scientifically nonexistent?

I ask these questions because H.R. 810 is silent on these issues. It does not specify how long these embryos are allowed to grow before they are killed—2 days, 5 days, 14 days or more. Proponents of H.R. 810 will claim that their legislation will address the ethical manner in which this research will be conducted. Yet their legislation is silent on the ethics, other than subsection C that directs the Secretary of HHS to create guidelines within 60 days.

Two presidential bioethics advisory panels have given us differing guidance on when and how research should be conducted. If this Nation, through its elected leaders, allows embryonic stem cell research, then we as representatives of the American people should have the courage to state unequivocally where we stand and answer the ethical questions presented before us here today. As elected leaders, we should set some basic guidelines, not leave the guidelines to unelected and unnamed administrative officials.

I know many Members on both sides of the aisle, of all political philosophies, have struggled with questions of morality, questions of life and questions of faith this past week. Many of us have asked ourselves that same question, and I have concluded that this legislation is unethical and unnecessary.

H.R. 810 mandates Federal tax dollars to be used to destroy human embryos. These embryos, if allowed to live, would grow into beautiful children like the snowflake children visiting the Capitol today. They are human life. You, I and they were embryonic stem cells that were allowed to grow.

Congress should not take lightly the destruction and manipulation of human life. It is clear that the American public does not. Forty-three percent of the American public clearly opposes more Federal funding for human embryonic research. Fifty-three percent clearly support more Federal funding, according to CNN.

As I said before, this legislation has no limits as to how long the embryo can grow. The National Academy of Sciences' guidelines recommends allowing them to grow for no more than 14 days.

Again, this legislation is not necessary. Human embryonic stem cell research is completely legal today in the private sector. Embryonic stem cell research is eligible for State funding in several States, California and New Jersey, and is funded through millions of dollars in private research money, \$100 million alone at Harvard University.

Since August 2001, 128 stem cell lines have been created. And still human embryonic stem cell research is funded by the Federal Government today. The National Institute of Health spent \$24 million on embryonic stem cell research in fiscal year 2004, the last year that data was available. Twenty-two human embryonic stem cell lines are currently receiving Federal funding. These lines are sufficient for basic research according to the NIH director. Former Secretary of Health and Human Services Tommy Thompson has said that these lines should be exhausted first before we move any further.

Finally, embryonic stem cell research remains unproven. Not a single therapy has been developed from embryonic stem cell research. Instead of cures, embryonic stem cell research has led to tumors and deaths in animal studies. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) has had his staff scour the medical journals for real proof of therapeutic benefit of embryonic stem cell research, but has come up empty handed. There have been zero published treatments in human patients using embryonic stem cells.

While the promise of embryonic stem cells is questionable, the promise of adult stem cell research is being realized today. Adult stem cells are being used today to save lives. Recognizing this, the National Institutes of Health spent \$568 million in fiscal year 2006 on adult stem cell research. Adult stem cells are being used today in clinical trials and in clinical practice to treat 58 diseases, including Parkinson's, spinal cord injury, juvenile diabetes, brain cancer, breast cancer, lymphoma, heart damage, rheumatoid arthritis, juvenile arthritis, stroke, and sickle cell anemia.

I am pleased the House is passing legislation today, the Stem Cell Therapeutic and Research Act, to promote adult stem cell research. But we are faced now with a bill that is unethical and incomplete. H.R. 810 says nothing about human cloning, which is still perfectly legal today. I introduced legislation with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) and Senators BROWNBACK and LANDRIEU to ban all human cloning. The inevitable truth is that if we pass this bill today, the cloning of a human baby will only come sooner. There is no room for shades of gray on this issue. The, quote, therapeutic cloning that will result from this legislation will make reproductive cloning even more likely.

We should not allow the creation of life for the purpose of destroying it. That is what happens with this bill.

Let me be clear. I am committed to funding scientific research that will unlock the origins of disease and develop cures that can help my constituents. Again, 58 conditions are being treated using placental and adult stem cells, and we cannot begin to imagine the promising new treatments and drugs on the horizon. But we cannot let

science leapfrog our ethics, our morals and our legal system. This is not a partisan issue, and it is bigger than a right-to-life issue.

It is clear that adult stem cell research has opened the door to the dreams of lifesaving treatments and cures for our most deadly and debilitating diseases, but I do not believe it is time to open the door to more embryonic stem cell research and open the floodgates to human cloning.

I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 810.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, just speaking to the Members perhaps back in the offices listening, I have 820,000 constituents in Delaware, and probably more than a third of them have some kind of a disease that might be able to be benefited by embryonic stem cell research.

That is true of the figures in the country. We have 110 million people who have illnesses out of the 290 million people who are living here. They have visited my office. They have visited your offices. There is not a person in this room who has not had many, many visits by people who have very, very serious needs, whose lives are going to be shortened.

I am all for the first bill we debated today because I think it might help somewhat, but I have also looked at some statistics and I have come to realize that of the 15 leading diseases, adult stem cells cannot do anything about 14 of them and can do a only little bit about heart diseases as they deal with only blood diseases in terms of what they can do. Embryonic stem cell research has the ability, perhaps, to do much more than that.

People are going to get up and they are going to say, well, it hasn't done anything yet. They were only discovered about 6½ years ago. If you read the vast body of research in the United States of America on this subject by people who are truly knowledgeable, you are going to learn there is more potential here than anything that has ever happened in medicine in the history of the United States of America. Congress should never, ever turn its back on this opportunity.

How are we going to get there? How are we going to do embryonic stem cell research? I do not have time to go through the whole in vitro fertilization process except to say that we create embryos in that particular process. They are then frozen. They are generally used and well used, the 400,000 embryos which are out there, to help give birth to people who might not otherwise be able to have a child. But at the end of the process, a decision is made by the individuals that may be involved with that. If the decision is they no longer want that particular embryo, they may do a variety of things with it. They may, as has been discussed here, give it up for adoption.

They may decide to have it discarded as hospital waste. That is where the vast, almost all of them actually go as hospital waste.

We want to give them the opportunity to say, within that embryo there are stem cells which could help other people live better lives and give them the opportunity to be able, instead of having it put in a bag for hospital waste, sitting at that table, to be put over here, and the State to be able to do the research. That is what we need to do. We need to be able to develop that as rapidly as we possibly can for the benefit of all mankind.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 810, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act.

I have been in public office for over 30 years and throughout my career, I—just like all of you—have had the opportunity to change and improve public policy so this country may continue to flourish on the principles it was founded. And the 820,000 people I represent in the State of Delaware are a constant reminder to me of this responsibility. I am their voice in the Congress of the United States.

Some of you may be wondering why I have become so interested and involved in embryonic stem cell research. And frankly, the answer is simple—those 800,000 constituents.

We estimated that about one-half of all visits to my office are about health care and about one-half of those visits are by Delawareans who are suffering themselves or whose family members are suffering—from juvenile diabetes, Alzheimer's, cancer, Parkinson's, HIV and hosts of other dredge diseases. Year by year the groups would grow in number and soon we would have to get bigger rooms for our meetings.

In the early years we would discuss the necessity of funding the National Institutes of Health, and I was proud to be able to support Newt Gingrich and the Republican Party's drive to double funding for the NIH. And that funding has gone toward the basic science needed to find cures and treatments to our most debilitating diseases. But in the past few years, the number one topic on these groups' minds was embryonic stem cell research.

One little girl stands out in mind. I met her a few months ago at an event back in Delaware. Olivia was two months old when she was diagnosed with type 1 diabetes. Her parents were first time parents so it is no wonder that the practice of testing her blood sugar and giving her insulin shots was extremely heartbreaking. Olivia is now 6 and has never known life without diabetes. She is the person we are fighting for on the floor today.

She is one of 110 million people who are suffering that may be helped by stem cell research.

I remember very clearly the difficult decision President Bush made on August 9, 2001 and I know how careful he was to balance the needs of science with his own moral concerns. At the time, the compromise—to allow Federal funding for research on embryonic stem cells lines that had already been derived—seemed quite reasonable. But as we know, unfortunately, the number of lines eligible for research—once as high as 78—is now only at 22, with the NIH saying the number of lines will never get above 23.

So when DIANA DEGETTE and I began discussing how to expand the President's policy

in an ethical manner, I went right back to the speech he gave to the Nation in 2001. We wanted to be as consistent as possible with the ethics he laid out in his speech as we worked to update the policy. The legislation we are going to vote on today, H.R. 810, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act, which has the backing of the medical groups, the scientists, the research universities and the patient advocacy groups, mirrors the President's ethical requirements.

I will read them to you and ask that you think about them very closely:

(1) Embryos used to derive stem cells were originally created for fertility treatment purposes and are in excess of clinical need;

(2) The individuals seeking fertility treatments for whom the embryos were created have determined that the embryos will not be implanted in a woman and will otherwise be discarded; and,

(3) The individuals for whom the embryos were created have provided written consent for embryo donation and without receiving financial inducement. You may ask what is different—we simply lift the arbitrary August 9, 2001 date.

It is also critical that we are clear about what this legislation does not do:

(1) No federal funding for the destruction of embryos or human life. This is prohibited by law.

(2) No federal funding for the creation of embryos for research.

Under our legislation it is up to the couple to decide what should happen to their embryos. Embryos can be adopted or donated; embryos can be frozen for future family building; embryos can be discarded. After that initial decision is made, and if a couple decides to discard the embryos, our legislation would allow those couples to make a second choice—do they want to donate them to research?

An embryo or blastocyst is about 250 cells and the inner cell mass is about 100 cells and that is where the stem cells come from. They are created in a petri dish, are about 5 days old and are the size of a pine head. Of the 400,000 frozen embryos in in vitro fertilization clinics throughout the U.S., about 2 percent are discarded annually—that is about 8,000—11,000 embryos that could be slated for research. Allowing the option of donating these excess embryos to research is similar to donating organs for organ transplantation in order to save or improve the quality of another person's life.

The bottom line is when a couple has decided to discard their excess embryos they are either going to be discarded as medical waste or they can be donated for research. Throughout this debate you will hear about adult stem cells and more about umbilical cord cells and how these types of cells are sufficient for scientists.

This is simply not true. Umbilical cord cells are adult stem cells and they are limited.

Adult and umbilical cord cells are already differentiated into the types of cells they are, they are difficult to harvest and grow and they do not exist for every tissue type. On the other hand, embryonic stem cells are "master cells"—they have the potential to grow into any type of cell in the body, they are easier to identify, isolate, purify and grow and they are capable of continual reproduction.

Listen to what the NIH has to say on this topic:

Human embryonic stem cells are thought to have much greater developmental potential than adult stem cells. This means that embryonic stem cells may be pluripotent—that is, able to give rise to cells found in all tissues of the embryo except for germ cells rather than being merely multipotent—restricted to specific subpopulations of cell types, as adult stem cells are thought to be.

In 2003, 1.6 million people died of heart disease, cancer, diabetes, Alzheimer's, kidney disease, liver disease and Parkinson's. Of the 15 leading causes of death, adult stem cell research only addresses one. Adult stem cells have been around since the 1960s. Embryonic stem cells were only isolated in 1998. We must explore research on all types of stem cells, but the reality is the only policy that is restricted is the Federal embryonic stem cell policy.

The NIH is the right place to oversee this research because it can regulate the ethics, it provides for scientific collaboration and peer review and promotes publication so all breakthroughs are reported and all scientists have access to the latest research discoveries. Without NIH oversight there are no guidelines as to how this research should be conducted.

The United States has always been the premier leader in biomedical research in our country and around the world. As science continues to move rapidly forward, we need to continue to lead the way but we are not. Why should we waste one more year, one more day, forcing millions to suffer because of a policy that is outdated and unworkable.

Does this Congress really want to look back 10 years from now and say that we were the ones holding the treatments up? Or do we want to be the Congress that says, we back science, we want research to flourish and we play a small role in making that happen.

Support H.R. 810, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act and accelerate hope.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from California is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, a family invests their embryos. They are not going to save them for 1,000 years. Some of those embryos cryogenically deteriorate so they are going to discard those embryos. Others are just thrown down the toilet because someone does not want them anymore.

Those are the embryos that we can use for stem cell research, only the ones that are going to be thrown away. If there are 400,000, then we will use 400,000. If there are only 10, we will use 10 unless they can be adopted, which I also support in this bill.

People say that there has been no research. If you take a look in animals, they have actually saved spinal cords in animals, in heart, in Alzheimer's, but they just have not done it in humans. There is potential, both for adult and embryonic stem cell.

I have been here 15 years and I am 100 percent prolife, 100 percent. This is an issue of life to me.

I had a 6-year-old in the committee that said, Duke, you're the only person

who can save my life. Do you have a child with diabetes? Do you have a child with other diseases that could be prevented? Then you would support this. I am for life and I am for the quality of life, but I do not want another 6-year-old to die.

I opposed the California bill. It went too far. I do not support cloning, but I want to save life. We are this close to stopping juvenile diabetes. There are other embryos that are tainted so bad that you would not implant those and they want to study those so that they can stop those childhood diseases. But you cannot look a child in the eye when the only chance they have to live is this research.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER).

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, this is a grand and glorious debate we are having today. Think of what we are doing. We are debating the best route for achieving wonderful, healing medical possibility, possibility that would have been unheard of not many years ago. But it is only possibility. By definition, good research is always about possibility, about the potential of finding the answers to that which we do not know.

Let me share three perspectives with you today. First, that of a friend. This is a picture of a family I know. The mother, father and I trained together at the medical school in Arkansas. She was diagnosed with insulin dependent diabetes at age 7. She had early complications with retinal problems caused by the diabetes. Her husband is a doctor. Five years ago he had an accident and now has paralysis caused by spinal cord injury at the C7-T1 level. This family has hope, realistic hope that sometime in the many years of life ahead of them, medical research may give them the possibility of cure or dramatic improvement in her diabetes and his spinal cord injury.

Second, as a family doctor, I practiced medicine. My patients and I relied on past research done by many good scientists striving in an ethical manner to end the harsh realities of so many diseases. I know some of my friends in opposition to this bill today argue that embryonic stem cell research is junk science. I do not share this view, but to those of you pondering this view today I say, let our gifted researchers, not us legislators, answer the unanswered scientific questions for us. Funded ethical research is not junk science. Premature conclusion is.

Third, as patients, my wife and I have ventured into the world of fertility clinics. We have met doctors and nurses all working hard to help couples have families, and we have studied and prayed over the patient consent forms. The ultimate decision on what happens to unneeded embryos should be up to that fully informed family, and fully informed consent is part of this bill.

I support this bill today. I do not know what, if anything, will come from this funded research. That is why we do the research.

Please vote "yes" for this bill.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE), a physician for 25 years in Georgia and a member of the faculty at Emory University.

(Mr. PRICE of Georgia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as a physician, I know that respected scientists believe that misrepresentations and exaggerated claims in this debate are not only scientifically irresponsible, they are deceptive and cruel to millions of patients and their families who hope desperately for cures.

It seems to me that there is one unmistakable fact. Many in our society have sincere, heartfelt, passionate, ethical questions, worthy of our respect, regarding the scientific or medical use of embryonic stem cells. If our goal is truly to cure diseases and help patients, science tells us that today the use of adult and cord stem cells has successfully treated or holds real potential for treating nearly 60 diseases. The same cannot be said for embryonic stem cells, and adult stem cells carry none of the ethical questions or dilemma of embryonic stem cells.

I support stem cell research, active, aggressive and scientifically based, with respect for the difficult ethical questions we face today. I urge my colleagues to join me in respecting science, in respecting ethical concerns. If we do, we will recognize that stem cell research and treatment of disease should actively proceed with those adult and cord stem cells that are providing and will increasingly provide excellent and exciting cures for patients in need.

□ 1415

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), who has been a wonderful help on this bill.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I am fortunate to represent the University of Wisconsin, Madison, where Dr. Jamie Thompson and his team were the first to derive and culture human embryonic stem cells in a lab. These cells can be described as the parent cells of all tissues in the body. Embryonic stem cells open the possibility of dramatic new medical treatments, transplantation therapies, and cures.

But at 9 p.m. on August 9, 2001, the hope and promise of this embryonic stem cell research was greatly curtailed. President Bush declared that researchers who received Federal funding could work only with embryonic stem cell lines created before that date and time. There were supposed to be 78

lines that were eligible for federally funded research. However, due to age, old technologies, contamination, only 22 are useful for research today.

Mr. Speaker, why are we tying the hands of our scientists who receive NIH grants or other Federal dollars to support their research? Why are we curtailing scientific progress in America while scientists in other countries rapidly seize the opportunity inherent in advancing this research?

H.R. 810 creates strong new safeguards and guidelines concerning research on human embryonic stem cells. Strict criteria, including written informed consent for donation, must be met before Federal researchers can derive and culture new stem cell lines.

Some Members on the other side of this debate say their constituents are opposed to their Federal tax dollars being used on this groundbreaking science. Well, I have constituents as well, like young Jessie Alswager of Madison, Wisconsin. Jessie has juvenile diabetes, and every year he comes to Washington to lobby for this research to move us closer to a cure. Jessie is only 8; so I do not think he pays taxes yet; but his mom, Michelle, sure does. And Michelle, like millions of other Americans who could be helped by this science, very much want their tax dollars spent on stem cell research.

I urge support of the Castle-DeGette bill.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the leader for yielding me this time.

I ask myself this question: If we are going to deal with this debate on embryonic stem cell research, what are the ethics of this? One can go to Google and do a Google search on permissible medical experiments. And I did that, and I found that there is a list of 10 things that have to be qualifiers for permissible medical experiments on human beings. One is the subject must be a volunteer. The second one is there must be no alternative. The third one is results of animal experimentation must be proven successful prior to their experiments. The net result in death or disability cannot be accepted. The seventh one is there cannot be even a remote possibility of injury, disability, or death. The human subject must be at liberty to end the experiment. And the likely result cannot be injury, disability, or death. The exception is if a physician wants to experiment upon himself.

Where do I find this information, Mr. Speaker? I find this information in the military tribunals under Control Council Law No. 10, October, 1946, Nuremberg.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS).

(Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, we need to remember that embryonic stem cell research is legal. In the absence of the Federal Government, the States are already taking the lead. California is at the forefront of establishing a robust embryonic stem cell research program. New Jersey has followed suit, and seven other States are in the process of doing so. We do not want our stem cell research policies left to the vagaries of State electoral politics. The Federal Government in general, and NIH in particular, must be involved. The less NIH is involved with its time-tested methods and procedures, the less we are assured of good ethical guidelines and scientific methods will be followed. Instead, we will have more and more individual States attempting to set up their own regulatory schemes, something they may or may not be equipped to do.

Opponents argue that it is the product of a utilitarian world view, that somehow this is a zero-sum game, if the Members will, in which life is taken in order to give life. I think the strictures that are established by H.R. 810 negate that argument. Under this bill, Federal research will proceed using those embryos not used in fertility clinics, embryos voluntarily given that would otherwise be destroyed, that is, embryos that held the promise of life but are certain not to fulfill that promise. What we are doing is extending the potential life where otherwise there would be none.

I urge passage of H.R. 810.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. BONO), a member of the committee.

Mrs. BONO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 810. I would like to thank the chairman for all of his work in bringing this bill to the floor, and I would like to thank my leadership for allowing a vote on this important legislation.

As Representatives, we are in the unique position to frequently meet with a wide cross-section of people, many of whom are suffering from debilitating diseases, injuries, and ailments. These millions of patients, as well as their loved ones, have a clear message for policymakers: we support this research and we need their help.

Opponents of this bill have argued that we should not use Federal funds to pay for embryonic stem cell research. I respectfully disagree. The issue at hand is allowing for more pristine stem cell lines to be eligible for research. Scientists and researchers throughout the United States are constantly reminding us that the focus needs to be on the quality of the stem cell lines available which are eligible for Federal research. I would also like to state that there is no funding for the derivation of the lines and the lines must be ethically in accordance with the principles the President has laid out in his policy. We are undoubtedly slowing research

progress by forbidding researchers from using Federal funds to conduct research.

Former First Lady Nancy Reagan has said about embryonic stem cell research: "Science has presented us with a hope called stem cell research, which may provide our scientists with many answers that for so long have been beyond our grasp. I just don't see how we can turn our backs on this. We have lost so much time already. I just really can't bear to lose any more."

We all know that the impetus for Nancy Reagan was the battle that her husband, President Ronald Reagan, fought with Alzheimer's disease. The former first lady is not alone. Over 4.5 million Americans are affected by Alzheimer's. I am encouraged by scientists' claims that embryonic stem cells will allow for more research on Alzheimer's, including the possibility that they may be used to grow new brain cells to replace the brain tissue destroyed by the disease.

Dana Reeves, the widow of actor and activist Christopher Reeves, sat with me less than 2 months ago and shared her family's devastating story. The potential for turning the hope for spinal cord injury into reality is evident, and I believe that by passing this legislation we can clear the way for research to move forward.

Dana and Nancy are just two of the more visible faces of public figures who have asked for this research.

Mr. Speaker, I implore my colleagues to please support this legislation, H.R. 810.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I stand today in strong support of the bipartisan Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act of 2005.

One of the few places this is really an extremely controversial bill is right here because the majority of Americans strongly support embryonic stem cell research. They want the Federal Government to fund research that is critical for some 128 million Americans who suffer from juvenile diabetes, Parkinson's, Alzheimer's, cancer, heart disease, spinal cord injuries, ALS, and other diseases.

Stem cell research is a medical issue, one that should and fortunately does transcend political lines and instead focuses on human lives. One such life is that of Clara Livingston, a 9-year-old girl with diabetes. During her testimony last week in a hearing in Chicago, Clara said, "There are things I don't like about diabetes. I have to put a one-inch needle into my skin to connect my insulin pump. I don't like pricks or shots. I don't like having high blood sugar and not being able to eat. I don't like going low and fainting." She continued, "I would like to find a cure because finding a cure will help make America and the rest of the world not worry about diabetes."

Most scientists agree that embryonic stem cell research offers the greatest hope to patients like Clara. There are limitations on the usefulness of adult stem cells when compared to embryonic stem cells. For example, there are no adult stem cells in the pancreas. That means that adult stem cell research will be inadequate in helping Clara or any other patients who are patients hoping for a cure for diabetes.

While it is important to continue working with adult stem cells, it is also vital to fund the research funding embryonic stem cells. We do a grave disservice to millions of children and adults living with serious illness, as well as the millions who will develop these conditions in the future, by prohibiting promising research. This bill will lift these arbitrary restrictions and permit funding of cell lines regardless of where they were created. Federal funding guidelines assure that research will meet ethical standards and allow advancements to be made as quickly as possible. As Steven Teitelbaum of Washington University in St. Louis said, "This is not a contest between adult and embryonic stem cells. This is a contest between us as a society and disease."

I hope my colleagues will vote "yes" on this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), who was an OB/GYN physician for 21 years and has delivered over 3,000 babies and understands that an embryo is a stage of development.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), member of the committee.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader and my chairman for yielding me this time.

I do rise in opposition to this bill today.

The debate that we are about is expanding Federal funding, not limiting research. There are no bona fide treatments available for embryonic stem cells. There is nothing in the laboratory, and there is certainly nothing in the clinics available to patients. Honesty is an important part of this debate, and I am concerned that more than a promise has been offered to people who are suffering and the reality is that those potential treatments are much more limited than they have been portrayed.

The President, I think, wisely put parameters, set boundaries around this type of research back in 2001. Let us not forget that private funding for stem cell research is available today. A couple who has an embryo developed in an IVF clinic is perfectly free to take that embryo to a lab at Harvard or California and have a stem cell line developed. The reality is in a poll of my reproductive endocrinologists back home: that never comes up as an issue.

But 22 cell lines are currently utilized. There are an additional 31 cell lines available, per Dr. Zerhouni's tes-

timony before our committee, that will be developed after the issue of animal growth medium becomes overcome. And there are two papers out this past week that indicate that that date may be quickly upon us.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that we follow the money in this debate. The reality is if there are indeed a third of the population of the United States who would benefit from this research, I believe that the big biotech money would be jumping into this. We would not be able to keep them out. They would be buying patents and capturing cell lines for their future use.

If there is one thing we learned in the last Presidential election, it was that both major candidates asserted that life begins at conception, and we are talking about taking a life. Remember that that inner cell mass that we are talking about that is taken at about 2 weeks of development, if we put that on a timeline of a human pregnancy, about 5 days later we are going to see a heartbeat on a sonogram.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is what the debate is all about. I urge us to protect life and vote against this bill.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Today we in the Congress are debating the essence of human life, the creation of life and the destruction of life. We are debating how one's family's life code, their DNA, is propagated and bequeathed to the next generation. Each human life begins as an embryo. What concerns me, as someone who cherishes life and is a strong supporter of medical research for epilepsy, for diabetes, for spinal cord injury, for Alzheimer's, for so many debilitating diseases, is that this bill seems to be on a very fast track. It is moving through this Congress at record speed and not under the normal procedures we depend on to make informed decisions.

□ 1430

Today I rise with more questions than answers on this bill. I respect the advocates. I respect those that do not support the bill. But I know one thing: On a matter of life and death, Congress should proceed carefully, thoughtfully and in an informed manner. All points of view must be heard and not suppressed.

Most surprisingly, this bill never had a subcommittee nor a full committee hearing. So my opinion today about this bill is: not yet. I am not yet confident that this institution has allowed for full dialogue to develop on a matter of such gravitas. Regardless of how you view the bills before us, the lack of a full hearing record is most troubling indeed.

I ask myself, why is the normal committee process subverted on a matter of such consequence? What do proponents have to lose? Where is the

committee transcript that will tell us the diverging views of scientists on the potentiality of adult stem cell versus embryonic stem cell to improve life? The fact is, there is none. Some evidence indicates stem cell research from nonembryonic sources now has made a difference in treating 58 different diseases. We need to know more about the science.

Then, where is the committee record that helps us struggle with the essential moral question of: how exactly does one destroy life in order to save it? Where is the committee transcript that reveals to the majority of Members not on the committee the ethical questions that we and every family should be addressing concerning the proprietary nature of the DNA in any embryonic cell?

We go to great lengths as a Congress to protect intellectual property rights, as our Constitution requires. After all, this Nation provides for patents for computer software, for medical devices, for seed corn genomes; and yet we provide no protection for the DNA of a human embryo? Whose DNA will be bequeathed to the future and whose will not?

How do we evaluate this bill when so much is missing? How do we evaluate which embryos should be allowed to be sent to research and how many to be adopted by infertile couples so those embryos can be developed into full human beings? Who will decide? Is it just a matter for the individual couple, or is there a larger, societal responsibility to protect life?

The woman whose eggs are being taken, how is she legally protected? How is her husband or mate legally protected in this relationship? And what are the rights of the embryo? Where is the hearing record that informs us how to carefully manage any transfer of human embryos to research so their essential worth is recognized?

We are told that the ethical requirements section of the bill will suffice, yet this section is but 156 words long. It directs that NIH will issue final guidelines within 60 days of passage of this bill. Sixty days? That is not even enough time to grow a tomato plant. I ask, is this realistic? And further, who will influence NIH without more congressional guidance?

Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of money to be made in this new field of life science. I think Congress should know who is likely to be making it, especially when Federal funding becomes involved. Which biogenetic and pharmaceutical firms stand to benefit the most from moving this bill forward? Exactly who are they? Which immunosuppressant drug companies? Do we as Members of Congress not have a right to know something more from the nonexistent transcript from the committee?

I find it most coincidental that last week the South Koreans doing research in this arena announced that they had cloned cells, making it appear as

though, if Congress did not act today, America would fall behind in the world research community. I found the timing of that announcement just all too convenient and asked myself, which companies were behind it?

In my opinion, the subcommittee and committees of jurisdiction have not met their responsibilities to this Congress, by abdicating their hearing responsibility. All we have are documents from outside proponents and opponents, and frankly, that is not good enough. Where is the hearing record to which all Members can refer which recounts the struggles of proponents and opponents with the ethical requirements that should be a part of this bill, and not merely leave it up to the National Institutes of Health?

On a matter of such magnitude, where some human embryos will be destroyed in the hope that new cures are made possible, the Congress needs to be more responsible.

I ask my colleagues to vote "no" on the DeGette-Castle bill and remand it back to committee.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The Chair would remind all Members to refrain from using audio devices during debate.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS), a member of the committee.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS) is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, a "yes" vote today is a vote for progress, for reason and for sound research.

Mr. Speaker, it is conservative to conserve, and this bill utilizes stem cells that have already been discarded, discarded because in most cases those who undergo in-vitro fertilization have excess fertilized cells available. Their only choice today has been for freezer storage, putting them up for adoption or discarding them, yes, into hospital medical waste.

Now we will add a fourth option, and that is to allow these embryos to be used for scientific research, to find cures for diseases that have afflicted Americans, a large portion of Americans, that threaten the lives of young people. This is not about life, this is about saving life, and it is important that the Congress make this statement for a brighter future for many, many Americans.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BASS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, we do not know yet, but the possibility is very real that stem cell research may be the greatest breakthrough in the history of science. There are deep and profound

moral and philosophic issues surrounding the research, but our government should be very cautious about coming down on the wrong side of science, especially when the scientific endeavor is designed to lengthen and ennoble life.

It has been suggested here today that no breakthrough therapies have yet been developed with stem cell research. This is simply not the case. Using, for example, the microenvironment of human embryonic stem cells, Dr. Mary Hendricks and her team of researchers at Chicago's Memorial Research Center have developed a methodology to slow the aggressive properties of metastatic cancer cells. How in heaven's name can we deny the promise of such research?

There is consensus at this time in this body and in the research community that scientists should not play God in attempting to clone human beings, but we are at a stage of human existence where there is a practical possibility that a blastocyst that would otherwise be thrown away as waste can, in a petri dish, be used to help solve these incredible diseases, from Alzheimer's to Parkinson's to diabetes to cancer.

If one believes that life matters, the balance of judgment should be to carefully open the door, as this bill, led so beautifully by my good friends the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) and the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE), does. Not to open the door is to put our heads in the sands and foreclose the prospect of a better life for many, many Americans.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) for the purpose of making a unanimous-consent request.

(Ms. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Castle-DeGette amendment. I have a friend who is alive today because of stem cell research and injections that he has had. He would love to have been here today to tell you about it. He is in the bloom of health.

Mr. Speaker, a couple of years ago, a very close, longtime personal friend of mine, John McCaffery, was diagnosed with lymphatic leukemia. He underwent radiation and chemotherapy treatments. But he remained critically ill. His doctor suggested that he have a stem cell transplant.

John was fortunate enough that his brother proved to be a match. After causing John's brother to overproduce stem cells, doctors at Strong Memorial Hospital in Rochester, removed the excess stem cells and put them in John. Unlike a painful, complicated bone marrow transplant, John received his stem cell transplant via an IV.

Without advancements over the years in stem cell research, John would not have had the option for a stem cell transplant. Rather, he would have had to continue with chemotherapy treatment until the cancerous cells eventually took over his body and he died.

Mr. Speaker, stem cell research saved John's life. And, I am very happy to report that today, John is once again leading a healthy, productive life.

The U.S. has the finest research scientists in the world, but we are falling far behind other countries, like South Korea and Singapore, that are moving forward with embryonic stem cell research. Adult stem cells from umbilical cord blood will likely lead to treatments for some diseases. But this must complement, not substitute, scientific research on embryonic stem cells—which is much more promising and will yield to advancements in the prevention and treatment of almost every disease American families face. The United States must be on the cutting edge of this important research. We have a responsibility to promote stem cell research which could lead to treatments and cures for diseases affecting millions of Americans.

Without question, the U.S. should set high standards for moral and ethical use of stem cells. But how can we do this, if we are not actively involved in the research?

Mr. Speaker, John is one person whose life was saved by stem cells. There will be thousands and one day, millions more lives saved if we do the right thing today. I urge all my colleagues to support both adult and embryonic stem cell research by supporting the Stem Cell Therapeutic and Research Act and the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and want to congratulate the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) and the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) for her leadership and his leadership on this bill. This is, I think, one of the most important bills that we will consider for the welfare of people not only in this country, but throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, let us be very clear about what this bipartisan, moderate bill would do and not do. This legislation, which has 200-plus cosponsors from both sides of the aisle, would not permit Federal funding for cloning; it would not permit Federal funding to create embryos, nor would it permit Federal funding to destroy embryos.

This important legislation simply expands the current Federal policy of allowing Federal funding for research on stem cell lines derived after the arbitrary date of August 9, 2001, from embryos created for fertility treatment that would otherwise be discarded.

Recall that on that date, President Bush announced that Federal funds would be available to support research on human embryo stem cells so long as such research was limited to existing stem cell lines. At the time it was believed that 78 stem cell lines were eligible. Yet today, as we know, only 22 such lines are available for research, and these lines are aged, contaminated or developed with outdated research. Meanwhile, there are at least 125 new stem cell lines with substantial potential that federally funded researchers cannot use.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, I believe the issue before this House today is this: Will we foster embryonic stem cell research, research that holds great promise for the potential treatment or cure of diseases such as ALS, Lou Gehrig's disease, Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, and other diseases, and offer hope to those with spinal cord injury and other injuries of the nervous system, or will we stand in the way?

I know that the opponents of this bill believe that we are ignoring the ethical and moral implications of such research. I do not share that view. But, in fact, this legislation requires the Department of Health and Human Services and the National Institutes of Health to issue guidelines for ethical considerations; it requires a determination that the embryos would never have been implanted and would have been discarded; and it requires the donor's written, informed consent.

Mr. Speaker, I realize this is a difficult issue for many. It is, however, I think, an issue that the American people have made a judgment on. It is an issue which they, I think, overwhelmingly support. The polls seem to reflect that at least 60 percent of the Americans asked the question support this important effort. They believe it holds promise for them, for their spouses, for their children.

We have talked much about life on this floor. It is important that we do so. It is important that we do so in a thoughtful and principled way.

I believe that this moderate, well-thought-out, carefully constructed bill takes a step that America expects us to take. This is the People's House. I believe the people would have us pass this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to vote accordingly.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. AKIN).

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AKIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, just in response to what was said on the floor, this is a statement that has appeared on the floor, and also in print, which says that the bill before us prohibits Federal funding used for the destruction of embryos.

By its very definition, it requires the destruction of embryos when it does the research. That ought to be very clear. The process talked about requires the destruction of embryos.

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I rise today to oppose public funding for the destruction of human embryos.

□ 1445

There is actually a very simple reason for that, and that is because you and I were once embryos.

Now, an embryo may seem like some scientific or laboratory term, but, in fact, the embryo contains the unique information that defines a person. All you add is food and climate control and some time, and the embryo becomes you or me.

Now, there are people who want to use public money to destroy embryos, and they talk about this bill as being a good first step. What happens if we run the clock to step two or step three?

My own daughter wrote a little story, and I will read it, about step three: "I lived with 40 others in a compound supervised by cool, efficient orderlies. Instead of playing, I stood pondering a troubling dream from the night before. It was of a loving father giving his child a name. I have always been just 52561B.

"I started imagining what it would be like to be named when the lab technician called me down the sterile white hall to my monthly checkup. I was given the usual clear injection and scanned. The medic flipped through the images which showed my organs and wrote, 'healthy, still usable' across the file.

"Several weeks later, I heard footsteps outside my cell and low voices. The door unlocked and I was led again into the clinic and placed on the stainless table, but the injection this time was amber colored and I immediately sensed that something was wrong. Numbness started spreading across my body, great agony, no breathing, and the table was lifted and I slid down a chute into a large, steel box with waste paper and garbage from the lunch room.

"My body now thrashed uncontrollably, but as everything grew dark, there was a bright figure who seemed to protect me. He looked at me with such love and said, 'I have given you the name Tesia, which means "Loved of God."'

"I awoke to see a wrinkled face with twinkling dark eyes framed by white hair. He must have seen my questioning expression. He explained, 'You were a clone being held as a source for body parts, but when a recipient dies, the clone is considered useless and is given a lethal injection. I managed to get to you before the poison finished its work.'

"I was stunned. After a pause, he said, 'What shall I call you?' At first I was startled until I remembered. I said, 'Tesia.'"

Mr. Speaker, this building was built by our Founders on pillars, but not just pillars of marble. One pillar was the conviction that God grants life as an inalienable right, and they fought so that pillar would not be toppled by tyrants. And our sons and daughters fight so that pillar will not be toppled by terrorists. We must vote today so that that pillar will not be toppled by technology that is run amok.

Oppose public funding which destroys little you's and me's, and oppose this harvest of destruction.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK), who is a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

(Mrs. MYRICK asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 810.

I believe in the transforming and the lifesaving power of research and science, and I have seen firsthand how cutting-edge research can make a big difference in the lives of Americans who suffer with all sorts of diseases, and, I understand the value of federally funded research. I also support stem cell research.

However, this debate is not about the merits of scientific discovery. There is no ban on research for the limited number of IVF embryos on which such research would even be possible. This debate is about Federal tax dollars and whether these dollars should be spent on the destruction of embryos, which I do not support.

Supporters of this bill say we have nothing to lose by destroying existing embryos with Federal money because, after all, some of them will probably be discarded anyway. I would ask my colleagues to recall the reason why we do not conduct scientific research on Federal death row inmates.

Aren't they going to die anyway? By all accounts, death row inmates are not innocent lives—but we don't conduct destructive experiments on them because it would be ethically reprehensible. We certainly don't dedicate taxpayer funds for that purpose.

Those who've studied the implications of an embryonic stem cell research expansion know full well that Federal funding for the destruction of existing IVF embryos is no silver bullet for disease treatment. But that's how the bill will be sold on the floor today. H.R. 810 is merely the first step in an effort to spend federal money—not only on the destruction, but on the creation of cloned embryos for research. I ask my colleagues to join me in opposing this bill.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS).

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 810 because we need to support studying every kind of stem cell, from cord blood to adult to embryonic.

Parkinson's disease affects over 1 million Americans, and I am one of them. Many people think that this is a disease that mostly affects older citizens. That is not true. I was diagnosed when I was in my mid-40s and Michael J. Fox, for example, was much younger than that.

Parkinson's does not keep me from doing the things that are important to

my life and my work, but Parkinson's does affect me every day of my life. There are good days and bad days, but there is still a need for research and for a cure.

Parkinson's has been said to be the most curable disease that is yet to be cured. Scientists believe a cure is on the horizon within the next 5 to 10 years. They also believe that the advances in Parkinson's research will lead to accelerated cures for other illnesses such as Alzheimer's.

Only embryonic stem cells hold enormous potential in order to treat these patients. Doctors treating patients with disease or injury may feel compelled to ease the suffering by taking every ethical avenue possible to find treatments and cures. These doctors are among some of the most talented, dedicated, and well-respected doctors in this country.

Today we decide whether to free these scientists or to hold them captive. We will decide whether those suffering from Parkinson's, diabetes, spinal cord injuries, and others will have the greatest potential for cures, or whether they will just simply sit on the bench.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that is the right message to send patients and doctors.

The American people agree. Poll after poll has shown that a wider majority of Americans support ethical embryonic stem cell research. The majority of Bush supporters, for example, have voted to support this research. Over 90 patient organizations, scientific and medical societies, and universities also support this research. Some think this research has given false hope to patients like me. But the science is moving forward and, with our help, will go even further.

This is really an exciting day for me, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate everyone who has helped us.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, as stewards of hard-working Americans' tax dollars, we cannot ask our constituents to fund the killing of human embryos.

Like the rest of my colleagues joining me today, I am strongly in support of scientific research to save and improve human life. But to fund Federal research on stem cells derived from killing human embryos is unethical and irresponsible.

While stem cell research has never been prohibited in the private sector, President Bush permitted the usage of embryonic stem cell lines sufficient for extensive government-funded research nearly 4 years ago. In these 4 years, government and private research on those stem cells have produced nothing, cured no one; and there is no indication that that will change.

In the meantime, ethical research not derived from embryos in the public and private sectors has helped cure almost 60 diseases. The private sector

has proven the superiority and promise of cord blood in adult stem cell research by choosing to fund those areas. Let us learn from their example and not squander taxpayer dollars on unethical research.

Mr. Speaker, we do have the power of the purse, and we cannot misuse it by funding the slaughter of human life.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 810. Science has advanced rapidly since the President announced his stem cell research policy. These cells were just identified less than 10 years ago and, already, the technology is progressing by leaps and bounds. The 22 lines currently available under the President's policy were developed using outdated techniques and have been contaminated, possibly skewing the outcome of experiments.

Given the promise that stem cells hold, it is time to drop the limit on current stem cell lines and allow researchers to do what they do best. It is tragic to let these cells go to waste when they could help to relieve so much suffering. It is time to let researchers go where the science leads them, not where politicians dictate.

In order to explore all of the possibilities, scientists must have access to all three kinds of stem cells: adult, embryonic, and those from the umbilical cord blood. That is why I plan to vote for H.R. 810 and the Smith bill as well. The two are not in opposition; they are complementary.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support H.R. 810 and for the sake of the millions suffering from diseases, I ask my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Missouri, the Show Me State (Mr. BLUNT), the distinguished majority whip.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time and for his leadership and the leadership of others on this debate today.

This debate is defined in so many ways by the conscience of each Member; and as each Member comes to the floor, as each Member speaks, I think my colleagues can see that this debate uniquely is based on their own view of this and their deeply founded view of this.

In fact, the whip's office is not real busy today, because we are not whipping this vote. I do not think my friends on the other side are whipping this vote either. Why would that be? Why would we have a vote on a bill like this that, based on the debate, is so important that we would not be trying to persuade Members? Because we feel on both sides of this aisle, apparently, today that this is a matter of real con-

science. This is a matter where people can deeply disagree. This is a matter about the very definition of life itself.

Because of that, I am firmly on the side of those who believe it is not time yet to federally fund this particular kind of research. There is private sector funding available. Some States like the State of California recently decided they would fund this in a significant way. Other States have decided they would totally outlaw research. So this is clearly an issue where the country is divided.

The ethics of this issue, as the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) suggested earlier, are not as clear as they should be. The future ownership and use of this research is not as clear as it needs to be. The first principle of bioethics should be: first, do no harm. We are not at the point in this issue where we can firmly say we are not doing harm. We are at the point when we can say that all of those concerns that this research is not possible if we do not fund it with Federal funding are just not right. This research is possible. I do not agree with it myself, but I particularly do not agree that we should take the tax money of millions and millions of taxpayers who believe this is absolutely wrong and pay for this research in that way.

I urge a "no" vote on this bill, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CARNAHAN).

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) and the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) for their leadership on this issue.

Like millions of American families, my own has been impacted by the loss of loved ones with debilitating diseases. My grandmother, Alvana Carpenter, died of cancer, and my first cousin Betty Stolz, to MS. We lost them too soon. That is one of the reasons I have joined this unparalleled and growing bipartisan coalition to cosponsor H.R. 810, along with over 200 Democrats and Republicans in this House. People from the Show Me State were polled not too long ago, and three-fourths of them were in support of this research continuing. Just like polls around the country, when Nancy Reagan called to lift the Bush administration ban on this research in 2004, three-fourths of Americans have come to the support of this cause.

There is great promise in this research. Since its isolation of the embryonic stem cell in 1998, research has made dramatic progress in the U.S. We cannot and we must not abandon our leadership role in the scientific community and in establishing strong ethical standards for this research, which are incorporated in this bill.

□ 1500

I also became involved in this debate because of the extraordinary citizens that have come to advocate on its behalf, advocates like Bernie Frank, an

accomplished St. Louisian who has volunteered for the Parkinson's Action Network; advocates like Dr. Huskey from Washington University, who suffers with MS and continues her advocacy; advocates like Rabbi Susan Talve and her young daughter, Adina, who suffers from a congenital heart defect. Early stem cell research shows the potential to discover ways to grow new heart muscle cells.

Mr. Speaker, the promise of stem cell research is real. Science, not politics, should determine the future of this vital research.

We stand here with the tools in our hands to ease the pain and suffering of so many across the country and around the world. To forgo potential life-saving cures is simply unacceptable and unconscionable.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON), who has graduated with honors, is a physician in internal medicine, and also has degrees in biochemistry.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as most of my colleagues know, I practice general internal medicine and I still do it. I have treated a lot of patients with diabetes, Parkinson's; indeed, my father died of complications of diabetes. My uncle, his brother, died of complications of Parkinson's disease.

Let us just talk a little bit about how we got here, okay? This body voted years ago, no Federal funding for research that involves the destruction of a human embryo. And President Clinton, towards the tail end of his administration, did an end run around the congressional prohibition, and they were having outside labs destroy the embryos, get the embryonic stem cells and send them over to NIH. And I sent the President a letter telling him, You are violating the spirit of the law, if not the letter of the law.

When President Bush became President, a lot of us alerted him to this problem, and he came out with his policy. And I thought it was really like a Solomon-like compromise. He said, We will not allow any more Federal funds to be used that involve the killing of human embryos, but we will allow research to proceed on the existing cell lines.

And I sit on the committee that funds this. We have funded this research to the tune of \$60 million over the last 3 years, embryonic stem cell research, what you are asking for more of. And the only place that I can find the research results printed is, I have to go to the rat-and-mouse journals. And the results are bad. These things tend to form tumors. The plasticity that some of you extol in these embryonic stem cells make them genetically unstable. They tend to form tumors. We call them teratomas in the medical profession. They grow hair and they grow teeth. They are genetically unstable.

Meanwhile, on the adult stem cell line it is breakthrough after break-

through after breakthrough. Indeed, the gentlewoman from Colorado said in her opening statement, there is no, no scientific evidence that will show that cord blood or adult stem cells will cure Alzheimer's, Parkinson's or Type 1 diabetes.

Parkinson's disease was successfully treated 6 years ago in Dennis Turner using an adult stem cell. He had an 80 percent reduction in his symptoms. This was described at the American Association of Neurological Surgeons annual meeting in April of 2002.

In 2003, Science-published Harvard researchers announced they had achieved a permanent reversal of diabetes in mice. This is now under human clinical trials today, while we speak. By the way, they tried to repeat that study using embryonic, mouse embryonic stem cells and it failed. And this lady was in a wheelchair and she can now stand up with adult stem cells.

We do not need this bill. It is ethically wrong. We should be voting "no."

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to recognize the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) if the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) also wants to recognize him at this time. I yield him 1 minute.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, we are all different. We are all different because we each have our own DNA. The ordering of genes in our body makes us unique. We have the color of our hair, skin, eyes, teeth, because of DNA. And each person has his or her own set of DNA, and that makes us each unique. Each and every person is valuable.

I am a supporter of ethical stem cell research, Mr. Speaker. I do not support the dissecting and destruction of living human embryos to harvest stem cells for the purpose of experimentation and research, and that is because each of these living human embryos has its own genetic makeup, its own DNA.

It is not animal DNA. It is not plant DNA. It is human genetic code, human DNA. The stuff that sets each person apart is there in this tiny little life that H.R. 810 would destroy. Each unique and distinct, but frozen.

Early today I met with a man, Steve Johnson, from Reading, Pennsylvania, who is in Washington for this debate. Steve was in a bicycle accident 11 years ago and his bike was replaced with a wheelchair, and today Steve is a paraplegic. And he has heard the promises made that embryonic stem cell research might help him walk again. For Steve, though, that is unacceptable. And so Steve and his wife, Kate, adopted a little girl. Here are three little snowflake babies.

He adopted little Zara when she was just a frozen embryo, stored at an IVF clinic. She was a leftover embryo that proponents of this bill would destroy for her cells. If someone had dissected her for embryonic stem cell research, she would not be here today. But she is here today with 21 other little snowflake children. Steve would not have his daughter because scientists want a laboratory experiment.

Zara is living proof that advocates of H.R. 810 are wrong on this issue. What they do not admit is that Steve Johnson's paralysis is more likely to be reversed using adult stem cells. How do we know that? Because recently, we learned that cells taken from a person's nose, olfactory cells, are helping people walk again. Cells taken from cord blood are helping people walk again, today.

Embryonic stem cells, no, not helping people walk again. They might say there is hope. There is no proof.

I would like to challenge the other side to put up in front of a camera one person treated for spinal cord injury with embryonic stem cells. You cannot, can you? We can. Hwang Mi-Soon, Susan Fajt.

How about Parkinson's? You cannot. We can. Dennis Turner. How about cancer? Leukemia? Sickle cell? You cannot.

Adult stem cells are treating human patients today for the very diseases that the proponents of this bill claim might hopefully one day be treated through the destruction of living human embryos.

The human being is in all stages of development, or disability, uniquely distinct and infinitely valuable.

House Resolution 810 is a tragic betrayal of that value.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, before yielding to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), I would just yield a minute to myself to respond to a couple of comments.

First of all, there is a misconception here. Under the Castle/DeGette bill, no public funds are used for embryo destruction. Current law precludes that and we keep that under our bill.

Secondly, we are not spending \$60 million through the NIH through embryonic stem cell research. Last year it was really \$25 million, and the reason is because the President's policy, issued in August of 2001, has not worked. Instead of 80 or 90 stem cell lines, we only had around 19 to 22 stem cell lines. And of those lines, all of them were contaminated with mouse "feeder" cells, and many of them were not available to researchers here in country. That is why we have to ethically expand embryonic stem cell research.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

(Mrs. LOWEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a cosponsor of H.R. 810, and

I rise in strong support of this critical legislation.

My colleagues, what an extraordinary moment we have before us. Embryonic stem cells have the potential not just to treat some of the most devastating diseases and conditions, but to actually cure them. At issue here is the fundamental value of saving lives, a value that we all share regardless of race, culture or religion.

But this promise exists only if researchers have access to the science that holds the most potential, and are free to explore, with appropriate ethical guidelines, medical advances never before imagined possible.

I also sit on the committee that funds the National Institutes of Health with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON). I am not a scientist, I am not a doctor. But as I sit on that committee and we hear the testimony, one after another, of people who are suffering, who have lost their loved ones, who are on the verge of losing another loved one, look at the 200 major groups who are supporting this legislation. And let us listen to them.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of H.R. 810, and I rise in strong support of this critical legislation.

My colleagues, what an extraordinary moment we have before us. Embryonic stem cells have the potential not just to treat some of the most devastating diseases and conditions, but to actually cure them. At issue here is the fundamental value of saving lives—a value that we all share regardless of race, culture, or religion.

But this promise exists only if researchers have access to the science that holds the most potential, and are free to explore—with appropriate ethical guidelines—medical advances never before imagined possible.

There is no question that scientific advancement often comes with moral uncertainties. We should and have ensured that difficult ethical and social questions are examined and debated before passing this legislation. In my judgment we now have a moral obligation to pursue each opportunity and provide crucial funding, support and oversight for this critical research.

Like many of you, I believe that strong guidelines must be in place with vigorous oversight from the NIH and Congress before allowing federally-funded embryonic stem cell research.

With appropriate guidelines we can ensure that the research with the most promise for medical achievement can be fully realized. While adult stem cells have yielded important discoveries, the evidence from scientists themselves suggests they don't have the same potential as embryonic stem cells.

The legislation before us today would strengthen the standards guiding embryonic stem cell research and would ensure that embryos originally created for the purpose of in vitro fertilization could be made available for research only with the consent of the donor. Let me be clear. This legislation retains the current restrictions on creating human embryos for the purpose of research.

So today I ask my colleagues to be as determined to find a cure as science allows us to be. With the appropriate guidelines in place,

we are closer than ever to remarkable discoveries and on the brink of providing hope to millions of individuals who otherwise have none.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 810.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just have to respond to the comments by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE). She must be reading a different bill. That is what this whole argument is about. The gentlewoman says that no Federal funds can go to destroying an embryo in order to have research. She just said that. That is what this whole bill does is to allow funding of embryonic stem cell research, and in order to do that research, you have to destroy the embryo.

In fact, if the gentlewoman would like, I would be willing to entertain a unanimous consent request that if, indeed, that does not happen in her bill, I will be glad to accept it and I will vote for the bill. That is the whole notion of what is going on here.

It is not true to say that her bill does not allow Federal funding for destruction of embryos.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank our chairman, and also thank the leader.

You know, I believe that everybody engaged in this debate today means well, and this is one of those great debates that we have on this floor. It is full of passion. But this is not a debate about passion. It is not a debate about style. This is a debate about substance. And the substance of this debate is life, clear and simple. You know, there is a fact on this, also, I think we ought to look at.

While we do not know where embryonic stem cell research might lead us, we do know that engaging in this form of research would require ending a human life for the purpose of experimentation. And that is something that I do not think any of us want to sanction. And in my opinion, we would be giving away our humanity, our sense of ethics, for the mere hope, the mere hope that this form of research would someday yield results.

Meanwhile, H.R. 810, the bill that is under discussion diverts funds from research that has proven results, from research that does not require us to look the other way while human life is purposefully ended.

Adult stem cell research has made great leaps. We have heard about that today. Cord blood research has made great strides. We have heard about that also today. And we hear that by using islet cells from living donors or adult brain cells instead of embryos, there is a potential to cure diabetes.

I think we should all vote "no" on H.R. 810. We should stop and look at the substance of the debate.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD).

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, critics of embryonic stem cell research maintain that it is wrong to promote science which destroys life in order to save life. As the leading pro-life legislator in Washington, Senator ORRIN HATCH put it, since when does human life begin in a petri dish in a refrigerator?

To reduce this issue to an abortion issue is a horrible injustice to 100 million Americans suffering the ravages of diabetes, spinal cord paralysis, heart disease, Parkinson's and Alzheimer's disease, cancer, MS, Lou Gehrig's disease and other fatal and debilitating diseases.

I met with researchers from four of the main stem cell institutes in America. As one prominent researcher told me, and I am quoting, "The real irony of the President's policy is that at least 100,000 surplus frozen embryos could be used to produce stem cells for research to save lives. But instead, these surplus embryos are being thrown into the garbage and treated as medical waste, thrown into the garbage and treated as medical waste."

□ 1515

Only 22 of the 78 stem cell lines approved by the President remain today.

As another leading researcher said, "This limit on research has stunted progress on finding cures for a number of fatal and debilitating diseases."

Mr. Speaker, it is too late for my beloved mother who was totally debilitated by Alzheimer's disease which killed her. It is too late for my cousin who died a tragic, cruel death from juvenile diabetes while still in his 20s; but it is not too late for the 100 million other American people counting on us to support funding for life-saving research on embryonic stem cells.

Let us not turn our backs on these people. Let us not take away their hope. Let us listen to respected pro-life colleagues and friends like ORRIN HATCH, former Senator Connie Mack, former Health and Human Services Secretary Tommy Thompson when they tell us this is not an abortion issue. We should support embryonic stem cell research.

Mr. Speaker, critics of embryonic stem cell research maintain it is wrong to "promote science which destroys life in order to save life."

As the leading pro-life legislator in Washington, Sen. ORRIN HATCH put it, "Since when does human life begin in a petri dish in a refrigerator?"

To reduce this issue to an abortion issue is a horrible injustice to 100 million Americans suffering the ravages of diabetes, spinal cord paralysis, heart disease, Parkinson's and Alzheimer's disease, cancer, multiple sclerosis, Lou Gehrig's disease and other fatal, debilitating diseases.

I have met with medical researchers from the University of Minnesota Stem Cell Institute, the Mayo Clinic, the National Institutes of

Health and Johns Hopkins University. As one prominent researcher told me, "The real irony of the President's policy is that at least 100,000 surplus frozen embryos could be used to produce stem cells for research to save lives. Instead, these surplus embryos are being thrown into the garbage and treated as medical waste."

Only 22 of the 78 stem cell lines approved by the President in 2001 remain today. As another leading medical researcher said, "This limit on research has stunted progress on finding cures for a number of debilitating and fatal diseases."

Mr. Speaker, the scientific evidence is overwhelming that embryonic stem cells have great potential to regenerate specific types of human tissues, offering hope for millions of Americans suffering from debilitating diseases.

Mr. Speaker, it's too late for my beloved mother who was totally debilitated by Alzheimer's disease which led to her death. It's too late for my cousin who died a cruel, tragic death from diabetes in his 20's.

But it's not too late for 100 million other American people counting on us to support funding for life-saving research on stem cells derived from donated surplus embryos created through in vitro fertilization.

Let's not turn our backs on these people. Let's not take away their hope. Let's listen to respected pro-life colleagues and friends like Senator ORRIN HATCH, former Senator Connie Mack and former HHS Secretary Tommy Thompson when they tell us this is not an abortion issue.

Let's make it clear that abortion politics should not determine this critical vote.

Embryonic stem cell research will prolong life, improve life and give hope for life to millions of people.

I urge members to support funding for life-saving and life-enhancing embryonic stem cell research.

The American people deserve nothing less.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, in 1999 young Tessa Wick was diagnosed with juvenile diabetes. She began the laborious process which changed her life and she dedicated herself to doing everything that she possibly could to ensure that no one would have to suffer as she has.

During that period of time, she has worked to raise large sums of money. She has testified before the United States Senate, and last Friday her father told me that she said to him not a lot has been accomplished yet. We have not yet found a cure. And her father said to me that we need to do everything that we possibly can to ensure that we do find a cure. We are all supportive of umbilical cord research, but I believe that it is proper for us to pursue embryonic stem cell research, Mr. Speaker.

In a week and a half, we mark the first anniversary of Ronald Reagan's passing. Everyone knows how passion-

ately Nancy Reagan feels about the need for us to pursue this research. I believe it is the appropriate thing to do.

Now, there are no guarantees. We all know there are no guarantees at all, but passage of this legislation does provide an opportunity for hope, hope that we will be able to turn the corner on these debilitating diseases from which so many people suffer. And so I hope very much that we can pursue a bipartisan approach to this important measure. And while I am concerned that there is disagreement with the President of the United States, I hope that we will be able to, at the end of the day, work out a bipartisan agreement that will include the President of the United States in this effort.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

(Mr. KIND asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation. And just to be clear once again during this debate, this bill limits the use of only those embryos that will be discarded or destroyed from in vitro fertilization clinics with the consent of the donors.

I rise in support of this legislation not because it promises cures for diabetes, Parkinson's, spinal cord injuries, Alzheimer's, but because it gives us yet another opportunity to discover cures for these ailments. Adult stem cell research, yes, let us do it. Cord blood research, absolutely. But let us also allow the Federal Government to get more involved in embryonic stem cell research.

The University of Wisconsin has been at the forefront of this research; yet our researchers are being held back because of current Federal policy. We are already falling behind the rest of the world in this research in light of South Korea's recent announcement last week. But it is precisely because the other countries are moving forward that makes our involvement all the more necessary. I believe that we as the leader of the Free World must provide important leadership on the ethical parameters, the ethical constraints that this research requires.

Support this bipartisan bill.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on all sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) has 7½ minutes. The gentleman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) has 34 minutes. The majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), has 27 minutes. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) has 17 minutes. The gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) has 12½ minutes.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to point out that it has been said that there are 100,000 embryos available for research. I guess they want to add another por-

tion to their bill requiring parents to give their embryos up for research because at the present time there are only 2.8 percent of the parents that have allowed or have designated their embryos to be used for research. That means there are only 11,000 available for this research.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, make no mistake about it, I support aggressive stem cell research and the judicious application of stem cells to mitigate and to cure disease. That is why I sponsored the Stem Cell Therapeutic Research Act of 2005 and I have been pushing it for almost 3 years. That is why those of us who oppose H.R. 810 strongly support pouring millions of dollars into Federal funds to support ethical stem cell research to find cures, to alleviate suffering, to inspire well-founded hope and to do it all in a way that respects the dignity and sanctity of human life.

I strongly oppose the Castle bill, however, because it will use Federal funds to facilitate the killing of perfectly healthy human embryos to derive their stem cells. Human embryos do have inherent value, Mr. Speaker. They are not commodities or things or just tissue. Human embryos are human lives at their most vulnerable beginning stages, and they deserve respect.

Parents of human embryos are custodians of those young ones. They are not owners of human property, and the public policy we craft should ensure that the best interests of newly created human life is protected and preserved.

The Castle bill embraces the misinformed notion that there is such a thing as left-over embryos, a grossly misleading and dehumanizing term in and of itself, that they are just going to be destroyed and thrown away and poured down the drain. That is simply not true.

The cryogenically frozen male and female embryos that the genetic parents may feel are no longer needed for implanting in the genetic mother are of infinite value to an adoptive mother who may be sterile or otherwise unable to have a baby.

Mr. Speaker, just one adoption initiative, the Snowflakes Embryo Adoption Program, has facilitated the adoption of 96 formerly frozen embryos with more adoptions in the works. I have met some of those kids. They are not leftovers, even though they lived in a frozen orphanage, perhaps many of them for years. They are just as human and alive and full of promise as other children. Let them be adopted, not killed and experimented on. They are not throwaways.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR).

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, the issue of embryonic stem cell research places humanity on the frontier of medical science and at the outer edge of moral theology.

On the side of science there is much hope, even expectation that extraordinarily effective therapies will be developed due to a wide range of maladies from diabetes to Parkinson's, spinal cord injury and a host of others. Progress has been achieved in the laboratory in animal studies and in human application. Much has yet to be learned, however, about adverse outcomes, which is why scientists proceed cautiously without overpromising and with respect for moral considerations of their research.

The latter gives me the greatest pause. An editorial in *America Magazine* said it well: "The debate over embryonic stem cell research cannot be fully resolved because it is ignited by irreconcilable views of what reverence for life requires."

Let us recall Louise Brown, the first test tube baby. Her life began as a single cell, fertilized egg, in vitro. There are many leftover potential Louise Browns, potential human beings as cryogenic embryos conceived in the laboratory. Are they to be discarded or, can they be ethically used for stem cell research? That is the moral theology issue that we must resolve.

I cannot get over the reality that human life is created in creating an embryo, whether in vitro or whether in utero. Each of us has to decide the morality of this unique aspect of the issue. But I cannot get over the moral theology underpinning of this extraordinary research on the frontier of science that we are tinkering with human life. And we must not tinker further. We know not where we head. It is between God and us. Let us resolve any uncertainty in favor of life.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the chairman of the Committee on Science.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, every invention, each new scientific concept, every technical advance in the history of mankind has been challenged and analyzed and debated, and properly so. Change makes us uncomfortable, forces us to design new paradigms; but in the final analysis, it is man's fundamental obligation to use science for the betterment of mankind.

In this instance, we are called upon to heal diseases that have plagued and bewildered us for centuries. It would be unconscionable and irresponsible should we fail to live up to our obligation in this critical matter.

The moral and ethical question is this, do we destroy embryos, simply discard them, embryos that will never be implanted in a womb but which can advance stem cell research to cure historic illnesses?

The answer is, no, we should move forward with important scientific research, forward movement which will

be enhanced in a measured way by passage of the measure before us.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS), the distinguished subcommittee chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 810, which I believe promotes human embryonic stem cell research at taxpayers' expense.

Now, we have already spent \$60 million. The gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) says, no, it is not \$60 million; it is \$25 million. But we have spent a lot of money, and I think \$60 million is the right number.

The gentlewoman says no government taxpayers; money will be used. Once a human stem cell is destroyed, who pays for the research thereafter? The U.S. Government does. The taxpayers do.

I remind my colleagues that despite all this money, embryonic stem cell research has not resulted in any documented success whatsoever as compared to the astounding success of adult stem cells.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) pointed out he could not even find any success. He had to go to some obscure manual publications to find notice of even the experiments. I also notice that there is no CBO estimate on this legislation H.R. 810. How much will this bill cost? We do not know.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

Nearly 4 years ago, in August 2001, President Bush announced his Executive order limiting Federal funding to studies on existing cell lines.

Mr. Speaker, the debate we are having today is about slippery-slope fears come tragically true. But the slope can get far more steep from here.

Just last week, it was reported that scientists in South Korea created scores of cloned human embryos that they then destroyed to produce 11 stem cell lines. The age of cloning is upon us.

Also recently in the news is the creation of man-animal hybrids, or chimeras, using animal sperm and human eggs, or human sperm and animal eggs.

The apocalyptic creations are the inevitable result of what happens when Man and government believes it can foster good medical ends from ethically dubious means.

It is bad enough that our government allows embryonic stem cell research, or that we have not yet outlawed cloning. The least that we can do is prevent the further spending of taxpayer dollars on these ill-advised experiments.

Mr. Speaker, had either, or both, of the respective stem cell research bills appearing before us for debate and been ruled amendable, I had intended to offer an amendment regarding another alternative to embryonic stem cell research: stem cells from teeth.

Another promising field of stem cell research comes from our very teeth: stem cells from human exfoliated deciduous teeth, SHED, aka "baby" teeth. Last week a con-

stituent of mine, Marc W. Heft, DMD, PhD, Professor and Interim Chair, Department of Oral and Maxillofacial and Diagnostic Sciences of the College of Dentistry at the University of Florida, pointed this out to me. The intramural program of the National Institute of Dental and Craniofacial Research, IDCR, of the National Institutes of Health, NIH, has been a leader in this exciting line of research. On April 21, 2003, NIH scientists reported that for the first time, "baby" teeth, the temporary teeth children begin losing around their sixth birthday, contain a rich supply of stem cells in their dental pulp. The scientists said that "this unexpected discovery could have important implications because the stem cells remain alive inside the tooth for a short time after it falls out of a child's mouth, suggesting the cells could be readily harvested for research. According to the scientists, who published their findings online today in the *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, the stem cells are unique compared to many "adult" stem cells in the body. They are long lived, grow rapidly in culture, and, with careful prompting in the laboratory, have the potential to induce the formation of specialized dentin, bone, and neuronal cells. If followup studies extend these initial findings, the scientists speculate they may have identified an important and easily accessible source of stem cells that possibly could be manipulated to repair damaged teeth, induce the regeneration of bone, and treat neural injury or disease. "Doctors have successfully harvested stem cells from umbilical cord blood for years," said Dr. Songtao Shi, a scientist at NIH's National Institute of Dental and Craniofacial Research, NIDCR, and the senior author on the paper. "Our finding is similar in some ways, in that the stem cells in the tooth are likely latent remnants of an early developmental process." This article is titled, "SHED: Stem cells from human exfoliated deciduous teeth," and the authors are Masako Muira, Stan Gronthos, Mingrui Zhao, Bai Lu, Larry W. Fisher, Pamela Gehron Robey, and Songtao Shi.

In addition to the studies of stem cells from dental pulps of deciduous, "baby" teeth, there are ongoing studies of stem cells from the periodontium, the region where teeth connect to bone. July 8, 2004, again, NIH scientists also say these cells have "tremendous potential" to regenerate the periodontal ligament, a common target of advanced gum—periodontal—disease. The enthusiasm is based on followup studies, in which the researchers implanted the human adult stem cells into rodents and found most of them had differentiated into a mixture of periodontal ligament—including the specific fiber bundles that attach tooth to bone—and the mineralized tissue called cementum that covers the roots of our teeth.

While most of this work is coming out of the intramural program of NIDCR, Dr. Heft shared with me that two involved extramural scientists are Dr. Mary MacDougall, University of Texas Health Sciences Center at San Antonio—also President of the American Association for Dental Research—and Dr. Paul Krebsbach, University of Michigan.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that we continue to foster existing, promising, stem cell research that is regenerative, not destructive.

□ 1530

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished and patient gentleman from California (Mr. STARK).

(Mr. STARK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 810. Our research policies should be decided by scientists and doctors at the National Institutes of Health and not by Karl Rove and self-appointed religious gurus.

If you believe it is morally superior to discard a single cell in a freezer rather than to use it to help millions of Americans with Parkinson's, Alzheimer's, and diabetes, and you are asked to donate an embryo, then by all means refuse to do so. But do not tell my constituents that we cannot alleviate their suffering because it might offend modern-day Pharisees.

Do not tell my constituent Don Reed and his son Roman, who is paralyzed from a high school football accident, that scientists working on stem cell research in California will not be able to collaborate with the NIH.

Many in government already think they have the right to tell you whom you can marry, what kind of birth control you can use and how you die. Now they think their moral superiority extends to the single cell level. Beyond my outrage at this arrogance, I am saddened by this country's precipitous decline in the estimation of the rest of the world.

If this bill does not pass and scientists of the world meet to discuss this rapidly advancing field, many of our key researchers will be stuck here working with the few stem cell lines that are considered inoffensive.

The Flat Earth Society will tell you that the U.S. has to show moral leadership, and just because the overwhelming majority of the world's scientific community supports research, it does not mean it is the right thing to do.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I do not need a lecture from the majority leader on moral and ethical leadership. I do not look to those that will not acknowledge the existence of global warming for scientific and ethical leadership. I do not think the politicians who so eagerly decided they knew what was best for Terry Schiavo know much about life, dignity, or suffering.

I stand proudly with millions of Americans on behalf of this country's tradition of scientific leadership, and I urge a "yes" vote for H.R. 810.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT).

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 810. This bill, which we have already heard today, would reverse the embryonic stem cell policy instituted by the President of the United States in 2001, and I believe it is very misguided, in my opinion.

I wish to thank the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) for their work on this legislation against H.R. 810. They have already outlined many of the reasons why the bill should be defeated, but I would like to share some additional thoughts.

First, let me say that good people can disagree on this issue. However, what we are discussing today is the Federal funding of the embryonic stem cell. According to the statement of administration policy this morning, the administration strongly opposes passage of H.R. 810. The bill would compel all American taxpayers to pay for research that relies on the intentional destruction of human embryos to obtain stem cells, overturning the President's policy that supports research without promoting ongoing destruction.

There are other vast financial resources available to fund this controversial issue. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote against and not allow embryos to be killed for Federal funding research that is ethically and scientifically uncertain.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FERGUSON), a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FERGUSON).

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank both gentlemen for yielding me this time.

The debate over embryonic stem cell research is important because there are no more important issues that we deal with in this Chamber than when we debate life and death.

Mr. Speaker, as I stand here in this Chamber today, I am a human being. I am a man, an adult man. Sometime before I was a man, I was a teenager. Before that I was a child. And sometime before I was a child, I was a toddler. And before I was a toddler, I was an infant. And sometime before I was an infant, I was a fetus. And sometime before I was a fetus, I was an embryo. I did not look like I do today, but it was me. That embryo was me.

At some point in our history, every single person here was also an embryo. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), you were an embryo once. The other gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON), the chairman of the committee; yes, sir, you too were an embryo once. The gentleman from Delaware, the sponsor of this bill, you were an embryo once. The gentlewoman from Colorado, you too were an embryo once. The gentleman from Michigan, you were an embryo once. Now, we did not look like we do today, but it did not mean it was not you.

A human embryo is a member of the human family. It has its own unique DNA. It is its own human entity. It is unique. It is irreplaceable, and it is a member of the species *Homo sapiens*. It is not just a bit of tissue. It is not just, as some have suggested, a couple of cells in a petri dish. It is human and it is alive. It might not look like you or me, but there was a time when you and I looked exactly like that embryo.

Today, we are debating embryonic stem cell research, a type of stem cell research in which a tiny member of the human family must die. That is not just my opinion; that is a scientific fact. The gentlewoman from Colorado would suggest that under this legislation Federal funds would not be used to destroy human life. That is simply false.

Those who conduct human embryonic stem cell research must destroy human life to do so. You cannot conduct embryonic stem cell research without destroying human life, and that is wrong. And it is certainly wrong to fund this unethical embryonic stem cell research using taxpayer money. And that is precisely what this legislation would do. It would use taxpayer money to fund research which destroys human life.

I urge a "no" vote.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I want to clarify something. I am actually not sure that those who oppose this bill understand what this bill really does.

In 1995, two Members of Congress, Mr. Dickey and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), inserted language in the appropriations bill, which is there every year and has been there every year I have been in Congress, and it says: "No Federal funds shall be used to create or destroy embryos."

Now, those on the other side of this debate say they do not think Federal funds should be used for this research, even though by their own admission the majority of Americans support this research. And so here is what this bill does, and maybe once I explain it, everyone will want to vote for it.

What it says is, People who go to in vitro fertilization clinics, there are leftover embryos as part of the process. They can decide one of two things: Number one, do they want to not discard the embryos and either donate them to other couples, and they can be these snowflake children, or to store them in a freezer? Or the donors can decide if they want to throw them away. Or do they want to donate them to science? It is their decision with informed consent.

Now, if they decide to donate them, then what would happen would be the embryos would go to a clinic where a stem cell line would be developed from the embryo with private funds. No Federal funds. The only Federal funds used under the Castle/DeGette bill are Federal funds to then develop those embryonic stem cell lines.

Just as the President's executive order in August of 2001 allowed stem

cell lines to be researched with Federal funding, but he limited those lines, we are allowing more of those lines.

So no embryos will be destroyed with Federal funds. I hope that clarifies the situation.

Mr. Speaker, I am now delighted to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I have never seen such a well-attended debate, which shows the importance of this issue; and I rise today on behalf of my father who died of Parkinson's Disease. I also rise today on behalf of the millions of Americans like me who have watched their loved ones battle the ravages of some dreaded disease.

I ask my colleagues, How many more lives must be ended or ravaged until our government gives researchers the wherewithal to simply do their jobs?

Although there are no guarantees, many scientists have told me that embryonic stem cell research offers the best and only hope to discover a cure for many, many dreaded diseases. Embryonic research offers scientists the opportunity to extend life and the quality of life for future generations of Americans.

As we are debating, other countries, other States, other people are moving forward with research with all speed. We should pass the DeGette/Castle bill. Life is too precious to wait.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 810, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act of 2005. As a founder and co-chair of the Congressional Working Group on Parkinson's Disease, I support this legislation that will expand the number of stem cell lines that are available for federally funded research. I believe this bill will reopen the doors to scientific inquiry, allowing us to be able, once again, to utilize embryonic stem cells while adhering to strict ethical guidelines.

I am and continue to be an opponent of human cloning. However, I recognize that we must move forward with ethical research that could lead to new drug therapies. We owe this to those suffering from Parkinson's disease, heart disease, stroke, diabetes, and Lou Gehrig's disease. And we owe this to scientists who are eager to explore new frontiers of science and medicine, but who are restrained by Federal restrictions.

Mr. Speaker, I have met with doctors, scientists, and researchers in my district's leading medical institutions who warn of a "brain drain" as their best and brightest relocate to places where funding for embryonic stem cell research is not restricted.

I have spoken with lawmakers in the State of New York, who have garnered \$1 billion in embryonic stem cell research funding, but without Federal funding, stem cell research will move forward without crucial oversight and guidelines.

I have been persuaded by directors at the National Institutes of Health who have spoken out against the White House policy on stem cells.

And I have been moved by the pleas of my constituents who are eager to find cures for suffering loved ones.

Mr. Speaker, this is a mandate.

In 2003, over 900,000 Americans died of heart disease and more than 550,000 suc-

cumbed to cancer. I am sure that many in this Chamber have seen friends suffer through the misery of cancer and the indignities of chemotherapy. Who among us has not had a parent or grandparent look at us with vacant eyes because Alzheimer's has stolen their memory away from them? Too many of us have watched as our children with Juvenile Diabetes hold back tears as they give themselves insulin injections each day. Mr. Speaker, it does not have to be this way. Healing our children, family, and friends is a bipartisan issue. In fact, it is a moral imperative.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HART).

Ms. HART. Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader for yielding me this time, and I am rising in opposition to the legislation that would fund the destruction of embryos in order to take the stem cells for research.

There are a number of reasons that I oppose the bill. The very first one, though, is one of the statements we keep hearing over and over again from those who support the bill, and that is that these embryos would just be discarded. This morning, I met several families, parents with young children who are here in Washington. These children were just like every other child, but they were different. And they were different because these children are the snowflake babies.

They have been referred to a little bit today, but for those just joining the argument, the snowflake babies are born from what would have been discarded embryos in fertilization clinics. It is important that we know this, because it is not, no option, that these embryos would be discarded or tossed aside.

It is true these embryos are often adopted. And, in fact, the children I met today were wonderful evidence of that. It looks like these embryos do not have to be discarded. All they needed was a mother and 9 months.

We do not have to choose between embryonic stem cell research and cord blood, assuming that only embryonic can solve problems. And, in fact, there is no proof that embryonic stem cell research can be successful. This list on the left on this chart shows all the different treatments currently using adult stem cells. On the right is the list of success with embryonic stem cells. It is a pretty empty list.

I encourage my colleagues to reject the false promise of embryonic stem cell research and reject this legislation.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE).

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I come from Florida, and a lot of people think that only retirees and seniors live in Florida, but I want to put a face on a couple that was very successful with in vitro fertilization. They are 47 years old. They had a daughter born as a result of in vitro

fertilization. The child was born with multiple heart problems and had to have three surgeries before she was 2 years old.

This couple believes that far more good can come from donating the remaining embryos for research. They have decided not to have any more children. And ultimately what we have not heard here is what the American people want. This is a couple that wants to be able to donate the embryos, which certainly they can do now, but they also want to have Federal research dollars go toward this.

This really is all about where taxpayer dollars go. And when you look at the huge book of pork that comes out every single year, when we go back home and say to our constituents, would you rather have some of this money going to, for example, some foreign countries that regularly turn their backs on us, or would you like to see some significant research done from embryonic stem cells that would be disposed of, the majority of our constituents are clearly going to say, use the money for significant research.

We have to remember that this is not an either/or. Certainly the umbilical cord research is a great science. We need to move forward with that as well as the embryonic stem cell research.

□ 1545

Remember, for this couple and her husband deciding to donate those embryos, they believe they will be saving other children's lives. They believe they will be helping an aunt who has early-stage Alzheimer's. They believe they will be able to help spinal cord injury victims. That is what this research holds the potential for. No, we do not have the cures yet; but unless we go forward, we never will. I fully support the Castle/DeGette bill, and hope other Members do, too.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 810, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act of 2005. I stand with 200 of America's most respected research organizations in support of this bill.

I would like to especially thank Congressmen CASTLE and DEGETTE for their tireless efforts on behalf of the millions of people who may benefit from enhanced stem cell research.

I would also like to thank Speaker HASTERT and Leader DELAY for the debate today and for giving the 200+ cosponsors of this legislation a vote on the House floor.

I rise today as a mother, as a concerned grandparent, and as someone who is worried that the untapped potential of stem cell research may be falling by the wayside.

In my congressional district on the gulf coast of Florida, I have had the pleasure of meeting Holly, a 47-year-old mother of two.

Like many Americans, Holly and her husband had trouble getting pregnant, and their first daughter was born through in vitro fertilization.

Her daughter was born with a congenital heart condition, and had three surgeries before her second birthday.

As with most in vitro fertilization procedures, Holly and her husband had several embryos

left over after the procedure. They chose to keep the remaining embryos frozen.

This couple was then blessed by a second miracle daughter who was conceived without in vitro fertilization. The happy couple decided not to have any more children, and had to make a choice about what to do with their frozen embryos.

Holly and her husband are well aware of Operation Snowflake and the adoption options for their embryos.

But, like many other parents, they would rather donate their embryos for research to help prevent heart disease—like their daughter was born with—or cure cancer, Alzheimer's disease or Parkinson's.

For Holly and her husband, they decided that donating their embryos for medical research would be their best chance to save other children's lives. Increasing stem cell research could find potential cures for many diseases that affect so many American families.

Put another way, the issue of embryos and their ability to be used for stem cell research is kind of like a flashlight. Until you put the batteries in, a flashlight will not produce light.

Likewise, only when an embryo is implanted in a uterus to grow, can life be sustained. Embryos sitting frozen in a clinic help no one. The embryo does not grow in the frozen state, so human life is not being created and nurtured.

In addition, when the couple stops paying the daily fees to store the embryos, unless they have the medical donation option, their remaining embryos will be disposed of as medical waste. That would be tragic.

Holly and her husband know this fact. They know that without the nurturing and love that a woman's body provides, these embryos will be wasted.

Science tells us that after as short a time as eight years, these frozen embryos will begin to deteriorate, and lose their viability for implantation.

Mr. Speaker, these embryos are too important to linger in a frozen test tube or to see discarded without helping mankind.

Additionally, I have yet to hear in this entire debate what opponents of H.R. 810 would do with those embryos that are not adopted, and eventually go to waste in a cryogenic freezer.

Would they want those embryos to be thrown out as medical waste, or instead help provide the basis for life-affirming scientific research?

Holly and her husband know that the great potential and promise of stem cell research will not move forward without their donated embryos and their support.

However, it is their respect for the culture of life that has brought them to this decision. They have weighed the choices available to them, and rather than donating the embryo for adoption, have chosen to let their embryos potentially save millions of lives.

Thousands of people around the country have made similar decisions to support life-affirming and life-enhancing research.

H.R. 810 will give hope where hope does not exist.

Passage of this bill today will let the research on stem cells continue under ethical guidelines, and will provide millions of Americans suffering from terminal diseases the hope that they have been denied.

All these organizations listed on this posterboard, such as the American Academy

for Cancer Research and the American Medical Association, support H.R. 810. I urge my fellow Members of Congress to vote yes on the bill.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished minority leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, this is an important day for us in Congress. I myself am deeply indebted to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) and the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) for their great leadership and courage in bringing this legislation to the floor. I thank the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) and the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

This is important legislation because every family in America, every family in America is just one phone call away, one diagnosis, one accident away from needing the benefits of stem cell research. We want all of the research to proceed, the umbilical cord research that we talked about this morning, and adult stem cell research. That is all very important. But we must have the embryonic stem cell research if we are truly going to have science have the potential it has to cure diseases.

I served for many years, probably 10, on the Labor-HHS subcommittee which funds the National Institutes of Health. So I have studied this issue over the years. What we are doing here today is recognizing the miraculous power to cure that exists at the National Institutes of Health and in other institutes of excellence in research throughout our country. We are recognizing the miraculous, almost Biblical power that science has to cure.

And what we have said, what we are saying here today is nothing that should not be considered of value. What we are saying is when these embryos are in excess of the needs of in vitro fertilization, rather than be destroyed, they will be used for basic biomedical research.

It is interesting to me because when I first came to the Congress, some of the same forces out there that are against this embryonic stem cell research were very much against in vitro fertilization. It is difficult to imagine that now, but they were against in vitro fertilization and considered it not to be on high moral ground.

The research is going to occur with Federal funding or without. It should not occur without high ethical standards that the Federal funding can bring to it. In order for our country to be preeminent in science, we must have the most talented, the most excellent scientists. They will not be attracted to a situation which limits scientific inquiry. As we all know, in science as in business, talent attracts capital, the capital to build the labs and all that is needed to do the research, and those labs in turn attract the excellent scientists, and that makes us first in the world, preeminent in science. We can-

not allow this important endeavor to go offshore.

I am particularly proud of my State of California where the people of California in a bipartisan way, as we are doing today, voted a commitment of resources to invest in embryonic stem cell research. We in California will become the regenerative capital of America, indeed, probably of the world. But this should be happening all over the country, and it should not depend on the local initiative of the State. That is good, but it should be coming from the leadership of the Federal Government with the ethical standards that go with it. We have ethical standards in California. They should be uniform throughout our country.

To some, this debate may seem like a struggle between faith and science. While I have the utmost respect, and the gentlemen know I do, for those who oppose this bill on moral grounds, I believe faith and science have at least one thing in common: both are searches for truth. America has room for both faith and science.

Indeed, with the great potential for medical research, science has the power to answer the prayers of America's families. I believe strongly in the power of prayer; but part of that prayer is for a cure, and science can provide that.

Many religious leaders endorse the Castle/DeGette bill because of their respect for life and because they believe science, within the bounds of ethics and religious beliefs, can save lives and improve its quality. Groups as diverse as the United Church of Christ, the Union for Reform Judaism, the United Methodist Church, the Episcopal Church, and the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America all support this bill.

The Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America says the traditional Jewish perspective emphasizes the potential to save and heal human lives is an integral part of valuing human life.

The Episcopal Church in its letter in support of this legislation says: "As stewards of creation, we are called to help men and renew the world in many ways. The Episcopal Church celebrates medical research as this research expands our knowledge of God's creation and empowers us to bring potential healing to those who suffer from disease and disability." This is what they wrote, and much more, in support of this legislation.

It is our duty to bring hope to the sick and the disabled, not to bind the hands of those who can bring them hope. I believe God guided our researchers to discover the stem cells power to heal. This bill will enable science to live up to its potential to again answer the prayers of America's families.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill, thank all of our colleagues on both sides of this issue for their very dignified approach to how we are dealing with this legislation today, but

also say that today is a historic day, that the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) and the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) have given us the opportunity to move forward, again to answer the prayers of America's families, to meet their needs, to allow the science to use its Biblical power to cure; and for that I am deeply in their debt.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY), a heart surgeon, a graduate from LSU, and chief resident of thoracic and cardiovascular surgery at the University of Rochester in Rochester, New York.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to vigorously oppose H.R. 810. It is ethically wrong to destroy human life, and H.R. 810 would allow for Federal funding to destroy human embryos.

As a heart surgeon, I have dealt with life and death. I have held damaged hearts in these hands, and I have seen how powerful human emotions, coupled with hope, can be; but human emotions coupled with false hope and misinformation are dangerous.

Embryonic stem cells have not produced a single human treatment and have significant limitations. They are prone to transplant rejection, prone to tumor formation, and there is a significant risk for contamination with animal viruses.

Proponents of embryonic stem cell research are certainly aware of these problems, and that is why they view H.R. 810 as a stepping stone to human cloning.

Adult stem cells have been used to treat 58 human diseases, and they do so without taking away what we are trying to preserve in the first place: life. Yes, life.

For example, heart disease, the number one cause of death in the United States, coronary artery disease, has been successfully treated with adult stem cell therapies; and there have been 10 clinical trials that have been completed in human patients using bone marrow-derived adult stem cells to treat heart attack patients, damaged hearts.

And in one trial, patients who were bedridden, not able to walk, were found to be jogging on the beach or climbing eight flights of stairs after successful treatment.

Mr. Speaker, it is irresponsible to spend scarce Federal dollars on false promises when there are certainly alternatives with existing treatments that do not create an ethical dilemma. And for these reasons, I oppose H.R. 810 and urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this as well.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, today the political center will hold with Nancy Reagan, and this Congress will stand

for Yankee ingenuity and stem cell research.

Our Constitution stands at its heart for the principle of the dignity of every individual and this idea is certainly central to our government and people. But there is a key American principle at the heart of our people that predates the Constitution. Nearly all of us are the sons and daughters of people who took risks to come to build a new life in a new world. If there is one American character that totally distinguishes us from all other countries, it is that Americans are innovators, explorers, inventors and scientists. We take risks, we try new things; and for 200 years the future came first to Americans, the most dynamic and forward-thinking people in all of human history.

We invented the telephone, the radio, the airplane, we eradicated polio. Americans now receive more Nobel Prizes in medicine than all other European countries combined. We stand for innovation and leadership, and this Congress should ensure that American patients never have to leave our shores to find a cure.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY), a distinguished doctor on the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, Leon Koss said that good things men do can be made complete only by the things they refuse to do.

Now I have no doubts about the compassion and convictions of both sides on this issue, but I take issue with the direction of their convictions, because in the end a life without a name is still a life.

Words cannot take away that this is a life. By calling them "discarded" or "unwanted" embryos does not take away that they are still lives. While some may see this as scientific efforts of ingenuity and future Nobel Prize work, it does not take away the lethality of this research.

Further, let me state that President Clinton's Bioethics Council stated: "Embryos deserve respect as a form of human life." In 1999 the council said: "Funding of embryonic stem cell research should be done only if there are no alternatives." The research that we have reviewed today and has been reviewed by this Congress in the past when these amendments have been looked upon over the last decade, is that there is still no alternative in the sense that the research is showing that cord blood stem cell research and adult stem cell research is where the results are found.

□ 1600

I have as much compassion as anybody. I have worked with developmentally disabled kids all my professional life and would love to see cures

for them, but I want to see the funding go in the direction where we can see success, where that direction has been achieved and we will continue to see that.

But above all, let us remember that there are other things in medical research and medical ethics which come together here because you cannot divorce the two. If we say it is all right to use lethal methods in our research to remove the life of an embryo, what next? What next?

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, twelve million baby boomers will have Alzheimer's. Three million baby boomers will suffer from Parkinson's disease. Juvenile diabetes, Lou Gehrig's disease, spinal cord injuries will wreak havoc on the daily lives of millions of American families. These diseases are going to bankrupt the health care system of our country unless we take action. Today, we can take dramatic action, a step, to deal with this looming crisis.

President Bush has threatened to use his first veto to prevent scientists from using Federal funds to search for these cures. This is wrong. Stem cell research is the light of life, the way out of the darkness, the life-giving, life-enhancing, life-extending path to hope.

Hope is the most important four-letter word in the language. We must vote for hope, vote for life, vote for a brighter future for all of our loved ones. Vote for hope for a small girl forced to stick a needle three times a day into her young arm. Vote for hope for a beloved mother whose loss of balance leads to falls in the night. Vote for hope for a spouse who realizes that his memory of life and family are dissolving into a forgetful haze.

Vote "yes" so that the next generation of children will have to turn to the history books to know that there ever was such a thing as juvenile diabetes or Parkinson's or Alzheimer's or any of these plagues that affect our Nation today and are going to turn into a crisis in the next generation.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN).

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I am one of seven children. I am the second oldest. My older brother John is 2 years and 2 days older than I. We grew up together closer than any other members of the family.

After I left this House on the first occasion, within 2 years, my brother developed Parkinson's. He has now suffered with it for 15 years. I have learned a lot of things from my brother, but one of the things I learned most of all was there is a difference between right and wrong. There is a moral dimension in most of the serious issues that we must face.

Would I like to support embryonic stem cell research without a question

of ethics because it might assist my brother? Sure. Would I like to see embryonic stem cell research in the area of cancer where it might have helped one of my sisters who has had cancer? Yes. Would I like to see it in terms of research of cancer that plagues 4-year-old children like my nephew? Of course. But can we divorce all of that from the ethical norm that we must present here?

We look back in history and, yes, America has oftentimes promoted science. But America has made mistakes in the past. The worst mistakes we have ever made in the history of this Nation have been when we have defined a part of the human family as less than fully human and then done things to them that we would not allow done to ourselves.

We have done it with slavery. We have done it with the Tuskegee medical experiments. Other countries have done it as well. The commonality among all of those mistakes, the greatest mistakes in our Nation's history, has been the ease with which we defined members of the human family as less than fully human.

We are talking about embryonic stem cell research that requires the destruction of the embryo, the destruction of part of the human family. We should remember that as we talk here today. We should resolve doubt in favor of life as we do in our criminal justice system, as we do in our civil law system.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as this debate has gone on, and it has been a good discussion here today, I think it is worthwhile to come back to where we are on this whole issue here.

The embryonic stem cell research we are debating here today is controversial because of the means of obtaining these cells. Research involving most types of stem cells, those derived from adult tissues or the umbilical cord, is uncontroversial except, as we saw, the second issue here today is, how effective is it? Is embryonic more effective than cord? Are embryonic stem cells more effective in treating injuries and illnesses than the adult tissue stem cells?

So we sort of have a two-pronged argument here yet: How do you obtain the stem cells and, secondly, the effectiveness of adult versus embryonic stem cells.

But I think in this whole issue here, we sort of lose questions. Before we even get to those questions, I think we should look at it and say, what is the ethical consideration of the human nature, and that should be the first question we should ask, not what are the means we obtain it by, what is left over when we obtain the embryonic stem cells, or what is its effectiveness.

I think we have to look at the ethical considerations. Because cloning is one method to produce embryos for research, the ethical issues surrounding cloning are also relevant. In fact, I be-

lieve those ethical issues should really be the first question we should ask before we debate the means of obtaining, or even the effectiveness of the proposed treatment.

I would hope that life would triumph hope and the question is really before we even get into effectiveness or means, but what is the human nature consideration? That should be the first question we should answer.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, as my colleague from Massachusetts eloquently stated a minute ago, today this House has a historic opportunity to vote for hope, hope for millions of Americans suffering with devastating diseases. These patients, their doctors and scientists, have reason to hope, the potential that embryonic stem cell research has for developing new treatments for these devastating diseases.

One of my dearest friends recently died of ALS, or Lou Gehrig's disease, which causes fatal destruction of nerve cells. The slow death sentence that ALS gives its victims is brutal. The disease took away my young friend Tom's ability to control his own muscles, paralyzing them and ultimately making it impossible for him to breathe. Stem cell research provides hope, not for Tom but for future ALS victims. Scientists believe they can use stem cell research to replace the devastated nerve cells that ALS leaves behind.

With heart disease affecting so many of us in this Nation, the promise of embryonic stem cell research has advancements for the human heart which are incredible to think of. Instead of patients suffering because their heart cells are failing and no longer able to pump blood, new ways could be discovered to replace those cells.

And with regard to cancer, stem cell research has enormous potential. For example, it could facilitate the testing of new medications and treatments, not in time for my daughter's life, but for her young children's generation. We cannot afford to wait.

And it could be used to grow bone marrow that matches a patient and is not rejected by his or her body.

In each of these cases, stem cell research holds out promise. It provides hope that longer, better-quality lives are possible. That is what this bill is about. It will expand the ability of the National Institutes of Health to fund this research and improve the chances for finding new treatments and cures.

As we have discussed, each year thousands of embryos no bigger than the head of a pin are created in the process of in vitro fertilization. A

small percentage of these embryos are implanted and, hopefully, become much-longed-for children. Some of the rest will be frozen, but most are discarded.

They will not be used to create life, they will never become children, they will be lost without purpose. But under H.R. 810, with the informed consent of the donor, under strict ethical guidelines, these embryos can be used to give life to millions of Americans. Today, we can give this hope to millions who have little to hope for now.

This is an historic opportunity. I urge my colleagues to do the right thing, to support lifesaving medical research. Support H.R. 810.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

(Mr. SOUDER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share a letter from a young girl in my district:

"Dear House of Representatives:

"My name is Kelsea King. I am 14 years old and have been dealing with diabetes for nearly 3 years now. There are many challenges in having this disease, both physical and emotional. Though it may be hard to believe, the emotional pain greatly outweighs the physical pain.

"My sister, Kendall, was also diagnosed with diabetes 2 years ago. She is now 7. It is very hard going through life knowing that both our lives could be shortened by this disease. It is also very difficult knowing what this disease makes us prone to, such as heart disease, liver problems, blindness and in extreme cases loss of limb. But the most difficult part of all is worrying about passing out due to low blood sugars, or being hospitalized. It is too large of a responsibility and too large of a burden for any 7-year-old and even for a 14-year-old.

"As you can see, my need for a cure to this disease is very great. But I do not want a cure if it takes the lives of others. I do not support embryonic stem cell research. I believe it is very wrong to take innocent lives for any reason, even if it benefits me. There are other ways of a cure. We just need proper funding. If we work together, we can find a cure through adult stem cell research.

"My hope and prayer is for my sister and I to be cured before we are adults so we can both live long and healthy lives. No one deserves diabetes but everyone deserves a cure through adult stem cell research."

The campaign for federal funding of embryonic stem cell research has been a campaign of half-truths, and at times, outright deception.

Advocates of federal funding for destructive embryonic stem cell research do three things consistently:

(1) Obfuscate the fact that a living human embryo is killed in the process of extracting the cells.

(2) Obfuscate the fact that there have been no cures, treatments, therapies, or even clinical trials using embryonic stem cells.

(3) Obfuscate the fact that there is unlimited private funding allowed for embryonic stem cell research.

As Chairman of the Government Reform Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources, I sent a letter to the Director of the National Institutes of Health in October, 2002 requesting a detailed report providing comprehensive information about the medical applications of adult and embryonic stem cells. It took almost two years to get a response from the NIH, and the response omitted many of the advances, applications and trials for adult stem cell research that had already been reported in peer reviewed journals. The one thing that was complete in the NIH response to our oversight request, was the listing of applications for embryonic stem cells: zero.

The applications for embryonic stem cell research was zero then, in June of 2004, and it's zero now. The human applications for adult stem cells currently number 58, and range from lymphoma to chrones disease to heart damage to immunodeficiency syndrome.

Finally, let me be clear: there is no "ban" on embryonic stem cell research. There is no limit to the amount of private money that may be devoted to this research. The research is being conducted throughout the country. The critical fact is that we are responsible for the public purse, and forcing the public to fund unproven research where living human embryos are destroyed is completely unconscionable. If private industry sees promise in embryonic stem cell research, you can be certain that investors will find it. But the public should not be forced to subsidize a speculative venture involving destruction of human life.

Fourteen-year-old Kelsea King, an articulate young constituent of mine, has Juvenile Diabetes. Her struggle with this disease is emotionally and physically challenging, but she is strongly opposed to the idea of developing a cure that would involve the destruction of human life. As she wrote in a letter to me, "I believe it is very wrong to take innocent lives for any reason, even if it benefits me." I am submitting Miss King's letter in its entirety for the record.

H.R. 810 requires the public to pay for destructive embryonic research that has no current applications. It's an empty promise to the millions who suffer with disease, and would surely pave the way for embryo cloning.

I am voting against H.R. 810, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Avila, IN, May 23, 2005.

DEAR HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, my name is Kelsea King. I am fourteen years old and have been dealing with diabetes for nearly three years now. There are many challenges in having this disease, both physical and emotional. Though it may be hard to believe, the emotional pain greatly outweighs the physical pain. My sister, Kendall, was also diagnosed with diabetes two years ago. She is now seven. It is very hard going through life knowing that both our lives could be shortened by this disease. It is also very difficult knowing what this disease makes us prone to, such as heart disease, liver problems, blindness, and in extreme cases, loss of limb. But the most difficult part of all is worrying about passing out due to low blood sugars, or being hospitalized for ketoacidosis (which is caused by blood sugar being too high). It is too large of a responsibility and too large of a burden for any seven-year-old, and even for a fourteen-year-old.

As you can see, my need for a cure to this disease is very great. But I do not want a cure if it takes the lives of others. I do not support Embryonic Stem Cell Research. I believe it is very wrong to take innocent lives for any reason, even if it benefits me. There are other ways of a cure; we just need proper funding. There is no proof that Embryonic Stem Cell Research is better or more successful than Adult Stem Cell Research. If we work together, we can find a cure through Adult Stem Cell Research.

My hope and prayer is for my sister and I to be cured before we are adults so we can both live long and healthy lives. No one deserves diabetes, but everyone deserves a cure through Adult Stem Cell Research. My sister and I need this, as well as the millions of other children in America who are afflicted with this disease. Please help us—support Adult Stem Cell Research!

Sincerely,

KELSEA KING.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) and the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) deserve our thanks for sponsoring the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act and working with so many families who have been impacted by diseases that may find cures as a result of this vital research. Their work and dedication on this legislation has been tremendous and praiseworthy. I also thank them for giving me the opportunity to cast one of the most important votes I will ever make in Congress.

Almost everyone has lost some family member prematurely. I think of the grandmother, whom I never met, who died when her daughter, my mother, was only 16. I think of my mother-in-law who never had the opportunity to know her grandchild who is now 25. I think of my cousin, who was brilliant and never got to realize his full potential.

Embryonic stem cell research has the potential to cure disease and save lives in ways never dreamed of. And it is only 6 years old. These are discarded embryos that were never in the womb. They were not taken from it and they were not put into it. But they can help save lives. That is why it is so important that we not only pass this legislation today, but that the President signs this bill into law.

Sometimes ideology can box you in and cause you to make wrong and harmful decisions. I think it is time we recognize the Dark Ages are over. Galileo and Copernicus have been proven right. The world is in fact round. The earth does revolve around the sun. I believe God gave us intellect to differentiate between imprisoning dogma and sound ethical science, which is what we must do here today.

I want history to look back at this Congress and say that in the face of the age-old tension between religion and science, the Members here allowed critical scientific research to advance

while respecting important ethical questions that surrounded it.

□ 1615

We know that by allowing embryonic stem cell research to go forward, treatments and prevention for diseases will not come to us overnight. But we also know embryonic stem cell research has the potential to yield significant scientific advances to heal and prevent so many diseases throughout the world.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON).

(Mrs. EMERSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I have a profound deep and abiding belief in the right to life. I have introduced a constitutional amendment to ban abortions every session of Congress since 1997 and have a perfect pro-life voting record.

Two years ago I visited the Bader Peach Orchard in Campbell. I met the Baders' son, Cody, after my tour. Cody is a handsome and articulate young man who happens to live in a wheelchair because of a car accident. Cody asked that I rethink my opposition to embryonic stem cell research because he thought that one day if it did not help him, it might just help another young person like him. I later wrote a note to Cody's family telling them that even after hearing his story, I could not do as he asked. And I have regretted writing that letter ever since.

My friends Joel and Dana Wood have a son James, who was diagnosed with muscular dystrophy when Dana was 9 months pregnant. James may never see his 21st birthday, and this is just heartbreaking. My late husband, Bill Emerson, and his mother, Marie, who passed away last night, both suffered from diseases for which stem cell research holds much hope: cancer and dementia. Embryonic stem cells are the only avenue for research we know of now that can possibly help alleviate those two diseases. Neither adult stem cells nor cord blood are plausible for the study or treatment of brain tissue.

I have met with ethicists, scientists, two priests, and my own minister to talk about this agonizing decision. But when presented with an embryo, an embryo that cannot live outside a uterus, an embryo that is going to sadly be thrown out as medical waste, and the lives of little James Wood and young Cody, I ask do they not have as much of a right to life as that embryo that is going to be tossed away?

I had dinner last Thursday night with my daughter and her friend, Will Coffman. Will's story is much like Cody's. We talked and talked about this issue. And Will said to me, We may never know how the story will end, but please do not let the story end right now.

Mr. Speaker, my pro-life credentials are unquestioned. Who can say that prolonging a life is not pro-life? Technology and faith continue to present agonizing decisions and conflicts. Each life is precious, and so I must follow my heart on this and cast a vote in favor of H.R. 810.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman physician from the State of Michigan (Mr. SCHWARZ).

Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have been a physician for 41 years; and like my good colleagues who will not be supporting this bill, I would expect we could tell the Members stories of all the blood and gore and problems that we have waded through in those years and done our very best. I also consider myself a guy who is pretty much pro-life.

This bill is not cloning. It is not somatic cell nuclear transfer. It is sound science. For those who have an ethical problem with the bill, I accept the fact that they have that problem and hope that at some point in the future we can sit down and discuss this issue. But for now they will have their position; I will have mine.

Stem cell research, especially embryonic stem cell research, is going to go on apace very rapidly in all parts of the world, whether it is Singapore or Korea or Japan or China or the United Kingdom or Canada, other places on continental Europe. We are being left behind in this. We have the finest universities in the world, the finest researchers, the ability to bring stem cell research to a point where we will, indeed, have cures for everyday problems such as diabetes, such as Parkinson's, such as Alzheimer's, and perhaps even being able to create neuronal cells to take care of people who have spinal cord injuries. Science will march on.

I believe this bill helps the living. Can there be any doubt that the potential of relieving widespread suffering with embryonic stem cells is morally superior to simply destroying the excess embryos? How can we call ourselves a culture of life when we ignore the living, when we ignore the infinite potential of embryonic stem cells?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The order of closing will be in this order: the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) first, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) second, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) third, the gentleman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) fourth, and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) will close.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington State (Mr. McDERMOTT).

(Mr. McDERMOTT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, while Europe and Singapore and Cali-

fornia and Korea are moving forward in an effort to relieve human suffering, the United States Congress, 435 theologians, have gathered here to decide a values decision. We have no guidance. There was no in vitro fertilization or stem cell research when Jesus walked on the Earth. We are left to make the decision on our own.

The decision comes down to this: a man and woman come in to a physician. He presents some semen. She presents some eggs. They put them in a jar or they put them in a petri plate, and it becomes an embryo. They have several of them; so they use one. They put it in the mother. She has a baby. And there are a bunch left. Now what shall we do with those? Shall we throw them down the sink, wash them away, or shall we use them to help people who have terribly debilitating diseases? That is what this issue is about.

Like the last speaker, I am a physician. I have counseled people who were dying with Lou Gehrig's disease. To watch somebody drown in their own secretions, someone that you know and care about, and then come in here and say we are not going to look for a way to relieve that kind of agony, we will not worry about a 13-year-old kid who gets diabetes and has to give himself thousands and thousands of shots and loses the length of life that most of us expect because of that disease; we will say to them, well, Jesus wanted us to do this. I do not remember the Lord ever saying that. I do not ever remember his saying, I gave you a brain, you human beings. I do not want you to figure anything out. I do not want you to make it any better.

This is a perfectly good values judgment on which everybody should vote "yes."

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Washington State (Mr. INSLEE).

(Mr. INSLEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I come to speak for life, life for people with diabetes, life for people with Parkinson's, life for people with damaged hearts.

What possible benefit is it for life to discard these cells without allowing them to be used to bring life, to save life, to preserve life? If these cells have any future, it is through curing disease. If Members wish to give them life, then let them give life to others. This is their only hope, and it is our best hope.

Dr. Connie Davis, the medical director of University of Washington's Kidney and Kidney-Pancreas Transplant Program, put this discussion in perspective when I was talking to her yesterday. She reminded me that the donation of a kidney used to be a controversial issue in this country. It is no longer so.

Our bill allows donors of these stem cells to make a donation decision, a donation to research. A narrow segment of our Nation did not stop lifesaving

kidney donations, and a narrow segment should not stop embryonic stem cell research. Healing is a moral thing to do.

I met a man at the Transplant Association the other day. He and his wife had, in fact, had an in vitro fertilization. He had other additional embryos that were available. He wanted to make those available to cure people with diabetes and Parkinson's disease, and he had one thing he asked me. He said to me, Let me and my wife make that moral judgment, not the 435 strangers who know nothing about my moral interior values or my life.

That is an American right to donation. We should preserve it and pass this bill.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI).

Mr. RENZI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the leader for yielding me this time.

I recall being taught that the mustard seed is the smallest of all seeds, and yet it grows into the mightiest of trees. And the same can be said of the human embryo, something so very small, so unseen by the human eye, and yet so special at the very beginning of life that it needs to be safeguarded.

The real heart of this argument is whether something so innocent should be killed and whether Americans should pay to facilitate the government-sanctioned experimentation on human life based upon a prospect, based upon a maybe, based upon a possibility, based upon the potential.

The government already takes 285 million of our tax dollars each year and funnels it into pro-abortion organizations. The leadership of the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) undermines my ability to love my country, undermines our patriotism.

I say stand fast against the secret pollsters and vote "no" on this legislation.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the debate on stem cell research challenges all of us to think carefully about the value we place on human life. Many of us turn to our faith traditions for guidance and wisdom. None of us has the right to legislate our religious beliefs and impose them on others. But as Members look to the teachings of their faiths for guidance, I ask them to remember that not all faiths hold that stem cell research is the enemy of life. The religious traditions of many of us do not tell us that a 14-day-old blastocyst has the same moral significance as a human being and do tell us that the obligation to preserve life, which includes the obligation to cure disease and alleviate human suffering, is paramount.

I understand and respect the faith of all of my colleagues. It is a sincere faith that reveres life. I ask them to

accord that same respect to the faiths of others.

Unfortunately, words have sometimes been used carelessly, and these words sometimes denigrate the faith of others. When the teachings of a faith are described as “a culture of death” because they hold that the potential to save and heal human lives is an integral part of valuing human life, that faith and its adherence are being slandered. How dare anyone slander the faiths of many Americans as “a culture of death.” God does not speak to one faith alone.

We hear lots of speeches about respecting people of faith and the need to bring faith into the public square. The people who make those speeches should respect all faiths. We should vote our consciences, but we should not denigrate the faith and consciences of the millions of Americans who seek to preserve life and end suffering and who believe that embryonic stem cell research can save lives and therefore embodies the highest morality.

□ 1630

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, most of my colleagues that support this bill are from the pro-choice field. I come at it from the pro-life section. A lot of times I disagree with my colleagues because I think in some cases they would go further, and a fact that many people will not take under their wing is that many of these stem cells are going to be thrown away, either cryogenically they deteriorate and they throw them away, or a woman says “I don’t want to keep them for 1,000 years” and they discard them. They literally throw them in the toilet.

Now we can save life. They say there is no good to be done. Animal studies have shown that work with the spinal cord, heart and others have been successful. We have not done it on humans. If you take a look at some of the blood diseases with bone marrow used, that is stem cell.

And we have hope in the future. I met a young man that had AIDS at NIH, and he only thought about dying. He said, “Duke, all I need is hope to survive.” This gives that hope, and I think it has promise.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the seminal question that we address is, should Americans be using their tax dollars to fund research that kills a living human embryo? My answer to that is an emphatic “no.”

It is our duty to ensure that we spend our money on things that work, and there are no therapies in humans that have ever successfully been carried out using embryonic stem cells. And that is really what this whole debate is about, paying for what works and pay-

ing for it in a way that is consistent with the morals of our taxpayers.

Look, even the President and CEO of the Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation, a group that is a strong supporter of destroying human embryos for research, he said, “There have been more promising results in adult stem cells than there have been in embryonic stem cells.” He predicted that their foundation would soon be spending more on adult cells research than embryonic research.

Private organizations like these are choosing to use their research dollars on what works, adult stem cells research. Washington must also spend its money efficiently on what works, while representing the values of the taxpayer.

I urge a “no” vote on Federal funding for killing living human embryos.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman that just preceded me, speaking to the House, said that he did not think this experimentation would work. Well, there is no way it will ever work if we do not allow the research to take place. There can be nothing that is more pro-life than trying to pursue research that scientists tell us will lead to cures for MS and diabetes and Parkinson’s and other terrible diseases that people now suffer and die from.

Some people have said, Well, let us have an alternative; let us use the stem cells from the umbilical cord.

Mr. Speaker, that is not a replacement for embryonic stem cell research that would occur if we passed H.R. 810, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act. We need to ensure that scientists have access to all types of stem cells, both adult and embryonic.

Rather than opening the doors to research, the President’s policy of stopping this work at NIH has set the United States back. It has meant that researchers who see the promise are leaving the National Institutes of Health. It means the edge that this country has had as a leader of research is now falling behind and we look to other countries who are going to take our place.

For the sake of those who are suffering, for the sake of what science can bring to us, for the sake of life, I urge the adoption of this legislation. I do not think it is a good enough excuse to hold up a clump of cells and say, this we value and this we will protect, and then to look at our friends and our colleagues, people we know and people we do not even know, and tell them their lives we do not value.

The United States is poised to assume a role of leading the world in this promising field. Vote for this legislation that will make it possible.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. BARRETT).

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this issue is more than

facts and figures. For me it is personal. It is about my children, Madison, Jeb and Ross Barrett. It is about my nieces and my nephews, Hayden and English and Jason and Andrew. They are not just names, they are living, breathing human beings. They are people I care about, they are people I love. It is my family. And they began life as an embryo.

Let us be clear, embryonic stem cell research is completely legal. What we are talking about today is whether taxpayer dollars should be used to destroy potential life, and, for me, life must supersede all other considerations, especially for the purpose of medical experimentation.

Life is so precious, Mr. Speaker, and as long as I am a United States Congressman, I will do everything I can to protect it.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO).

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill, which will expand funding for embryonic stem cell research, and I am proud to be an original cosponsor of it.

What I would like to say today is the following: Scientists have informed us, the professional scientists in our country, not political scientists, but scientists, and what they have told us from their considerable work and research is that this issue represents hope. It represents hope for the cure of diseases that plague so many of our people, from juvenile diabetes all the way to the other part of life, which is Alzheimer’s, and so many diseases in between.

This Congress and previous Congresses have seen fit to double the funding of the National Institutes of Health. I have always called them the National Institutes of Hope.

We are now on the threshold, we are now on the threshold of debating an issue that can bring hope to our people. It is up to us to have an ethical standard in this debate. That is why no human cloning is a part of the bill that I support. Why? Because no one supports that.

The American people are decent and they want an ethical standard, but they also want their Nation’s leaders to continue to give hope to them, hope for the cure of these diseases that cause so much human suffering. We have a responsibility in terms of our compassion, in terms of the instruction that our Nation’s scientists have given to us.

So I urge my colleagues to support this bill. It is an ethical bill, and it is a bill that is all about hope.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill which will expand funding for embryonic stem cell research, and I’m proud to be an original cosponsor of it.

Under this bill embryonic stem cell lines will be eligible for Federal funding only if the embryos used to derive stem cells were originally created for fertility treatment purposes and are in excess of clinical need.

Today, there are thousands of surplus embryos from fertility treatments that will never be used and will likely be discarded.

We should allow parents who choose to donate these embryos for use in federally-funded stem cell research to do so.

My home-state of California recently approved a \$3 billion ballot initiative to fund embryonic stem-cell experiments. It is the largest State-supported scientific research program in the country. This initiative places California at the forefront of the field and exceeds all current stem-cell projects in the United States.

But without additional Federal funding, our scientific leadership is being transferred overseas. Where the leading-edge research is carried out matters a great deal. Any policy restricting Federal funding for embryonic stem cell research threatens the long-term vitality of the U.S. economy, and most importantly denies millions of Americans hope.

I urge all my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 810.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY), who is an OB/GYN physician, who practiced for 26 years and has delivered over 5,200 babies.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening in opposition, strong opposition, to H.R. 810, not as a physician, not as an obstetrician-gynecologist, but as a pro-life Catholic who firmly believes in the sanctity of life.

I have sat here for almost 3 hours listening to every word of the debate as part of my job as a member of the rebuttal team, and here is my legal pad of notes and rebuts. Most of those rebuts are against people on my side of the aisle, because this issue is clearly a bipartisan issue. You have Members, Republicans and Democrats, who are for the bill, indeed the authors, and you have Republicans and Democrats who are in opposition to the bill. So I have got plenty of rebuttals that I could make, but very briefly, I will just mention one or two.

One of the gentlemen on my side of the aisle said that we need the Federal Government, we need the Federal Government involved in embryonic stem cell research and the funding of that to provide ethical guidelines to the States. You remember that comment, maybe an hour or so ago? Well, if the Federal Government is involved in a program where taxpayer dollars are spent to destroy human life, what ethical advice can they give to my State of Georgia, I ask? I think none.

You see, I firmly believe in the sanctity of life, and I believe that life does begin at conception, and these embryos are definitely living human beings. The gentleman just said a few minutes ago that "I can't imagine that a 14-week blastocyst has the same value as a human being." Indeed, it does.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask my colleagues to look at these charts and what we know with these so-called frozen throwaway embryos that nobody wants. Well, there are hundreds today of these snowflake children, and there

will be many more when people realize this is available to them.

Yes, it starts as an embryo, just a few cells, and then a blastocyst. But then here is a 20-week ultrasound with a beating heart and brain and limbs and moving, and then here is the final result.

Let me just say in conclusion, the gentleman from New Jersey talked about his development, his growth and development, and going backwards in his life. He stood in this well and said, "I am an adult man today. But yesterday I was a teenager, and before that I was a toddler." But he did not go the opposite direction and say "In 20 years I will be a senior citizen, and after that I may be in a nursing home and I may have Alzheimer's. I may be a vegetable."

You would not want to destroy those lives, any more than the embryos at the beginning of life.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say, if people want to donate their embryos to another couple for adoption, our bill allows that. But our bill also allows people who do not want to give their embryos for adoption to donate them for science, so the children who are alive today can be cured. I assume no one on the other side of this issue would want to force everybody to give up their embryos for adoption, because clearly that would be limiting the choice that people have.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent New Jersey, one of the few States that devotes its own resources to embryonic stem cell research.

To help us understand this humane line of research, let us look at in vitro fertilization. Several decades ago, many people raised concerns about this procedure; everywhere there were attacks using the term "test tube babies." But today there are 400,000 young people who are the products of in vitro fertilization, and in every case, there are eggs, fertilized eggs, that were not brought to full-term birth.

But people do not condemn the use of IVF. And just as we do not place ethical burdens on the children who were conceived through IVF, we should not place ethical burdens on the millions of Americans suffering from Parkinson's, Alzheimer's, diabetes, et cetera.

□ 1645

I am hoping that several decades from today, we will look back and find ourselves thankful that we came to a humane, prudent conclusion. Embryonic stem cell research will have yielded new ways to diagnose, treat, and cure tragic diseases.

I urge my colleagues to support the humane H.R. 810.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY).

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished majority leader for yielding me this time.

We are here debating H.R. 810, which directs the Federal Government to spend tax dollars on embryonic stem cell research. This bill, therefore, implies that stem cell research is not already going on, but stem cell research is alive and well in America. Adult stem cells are currently being used to treat people, and successfully.

This bill's approach, however, will remove stem cells from human embryos. This will kill the embryo. And whether we like to think about it or not, embryos are indeed human beings. Every human life begins as a human embryo; and by extracting their stem cells, this bill uses American tax dollars to destroy human life.

The embryonic stem cell research in this bill destroys human life, and I believe that we as the American people should not destroy human life with American taxpayers' dollars, not even in the name of research.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE).

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, I recently had a granddaughter born. I looked at that little baby, and I was in love with her when I went to ultrasound and we saw her, even before she was born. When I saw the little snowflake children, I thought about their humanness. I thought about what joy they brought to their families. I thought about little children that needed to be comforted when they were hurt, little children that wanted to be put to bed at night with a kiss and a story, their wonderful humanness, and I thought about what the American people think of babies and how we cherish them. When I see these little children, I know their intrinsic value; and how we treat people, in whatever form of development, depends on how we perceive them.

The embryo is a human being at an early stage of development. When we talk to many who have great knowledge about this, and I appreciate the doctors in our presence, we should never spend the American taxpayers' dollars to take the life of an innocent human being.

As I look at this bill, I know it is very complex; but we need to always support human life.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 810. I commend my colleague, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE), for her leadership on this issue.

Stem cell research is not about abortion. Stem cell research is not about human cloning. We are talking about finding cures for Alzheimer's, paralysis, Parkinson's, and other diseases. We are talking about improving the lives of countless numbers of people in this country. That is what stem cell research is about.

We are talking about putting American health care and researchers in the best position to finding the cures for today's diseases tomorrow and to preventing the diseases of tomorrow today.

This spring, I joined my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL), for a congressional roundtable on stem cells and on the biotech industry. Doctors, researchers, and scientists spoke about how the President's strict limits on stem cell research is prohibiting them from conducting the level of research that they would like to do.

I agree, but who is missing out the most are the 650,000 people we represent and the potential this research holds.

American medical research has extended lives through immunization, treatments, and innovations. From eradicating polio to advances in diabetes, American research has been on the forefront.

But there is still so much more that can be done and much more potential that exists. I commend my colleagues again for this bill being on the floor, and I support it wholeheartedly.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy of yielding me this time.

I have been touched by the personal stories that we have heard here today. I think people are genuinely speaking from the heart.

But the issue remains that we have embryonic stem cells that are either going to be thrown away for largely theological reasons, or they will be used for research to save lives. This research is going to take place in the United States and around the world. The question is, how rapidly? The question is whether the United States Government's official policy will remain frozen in place, or whether we will exert the same type of leadership that we have exerted in other areas of research, technology, and dealing with human health.

For the sake of life, for the sake of health, for the sake of our families, I hope that this legislation passes, that we will be able to make sure that the Federal Government exerts its appropriate role in making sure that we have the resources, the direction, and the control to do this successfully.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes and 15 seconds to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON).

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise in strong support of the legislation before us which I consider to be extremely important. It builds on the President's policy by merely allowing the use of embryonic stem cells created for fertility purposes to be donated with permission, but without payment,

by the woman for research, research to cure some of the terrible diseases that plague our lives. These free citizens would simply exercise their right and their conscience in donating embryos that would otherwise be discarded, destroyed, as waste.

I believe we have a moral responsibility to advance the research that saves lives, relieves pain, and prevents suffering, rather than destroying those embryos. Those embryos could produce the stem cells that would save lives, and should not be destroyed as waste.

Why do we have to do this today? Because if we do not, stem cell research will be done, but will not be uniformly governed by NIH's ethics policy.

Why do we have to do this today? Because no nation has created a sustained, strong, globally-competitive economy without the freedom to research the frontiers of knowledge.

Finally, why do we have to do this today? Because it is the right thing.

Now, we have heard a lot of discussion on the floor today about destroying these cells as taking life and, as a matter of conscience, this is a complicated issue and one on which we disagree. If you believe life begins when the sperm enters the egg, then, yes, you would believe this is a taking of life, though we would unceremoniously toss those same cells into a waste bucket. But if you believe that life begins when the fertilized egg is implanted in the mother's womb, which, of course, is essential for it to realize its potential for life, then using a fertilized egg that has not been implanted is not a taking of life. If, further, you believe that life begins later in the process, then you are not taking life.

So I ask each of my colleagues to think carefully in conscience when life does begin; and, on that issue, your vote on this bill rests.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU).

(Mr. WU asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this stem cell research bill. The science will go on with or without the United States. Diabetes, Alzheimer's, Lou Gehrig's disease, these diseases will be cured either here in the United States or somewhere else in the world.

This bill is not about human cloning, which I oppose. An embryo is special tissue. We should not create them with the intent to terminate them later. But here, the embryos were created with the intent to bring more children into the world. Many eggs were fertilized in this process and, once a baby is born, many fertilized eggs are left over, created with the intention to create a baby.

As Oliver Wendell Holmes stated, even a dog can tell the difference between a stumble and a kick. Juries determine intent all the time and, here, intent is crucial. These cells were created with the intention of creating

human life, and the only alternate fate for them now is disposal.

Let us not waste potential human life; let us not waste these fertilized eggs by destroying them. Let us use them to save human lives through stem cell research. Support the Castle-DeGette bill.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT).

(Mr. TIAHRT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, 58 to zero. Today we are asked to sear our conscience and harden our heart towards human life so we can experiment on fertilized human embryos because we are told it holds such great promise. The results from testing are far from promising, though. They are very disappointing.

But there is an alternative. The adult stem cell research has been very successful compared to embryonic stem cell research, and this success was accomplished without the destruction of human life.

In fact, more than 58 diseases have been treated using adult stem cells in contrast to no diseases having been treated by using living embryonic stem cell research. Fifty-eight to zero.

Mr. Speaker, how do we know the score? Well, embryonic stem cell research is being conducted in America with private funding, but that funding is lacking. So the labs have come to us for more money. Apparently, venture capitalists invest only in projects that are profitable, and you can see it is far from profitable here: 58 to zero.

So now we are asked to support embryo stem cell research because it is so promising, when the facts are it is not promising: 58 to zero.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON).

(Mr. UPTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bipartisan bill, and I will submit today's column in The Wall Street Journal written by Dr. David A. Shaywitz, an endocrinologist in stem cell research at Harvard, for the RECORD. I would call to the attention of my colleagues this column and particularly a couple of lines that he wrote today. I must say that I am one that will be voting for both bills today, the cord bill as well as the Castle/DeGette bill; but as you compare these two bills, let me note a couple of things that this noted researcher says.

He says: "Presently, only the few lines established prior to the date," this is in reference to the President's initial plan back in 2001, "are eligible for government support, a prohibition that has had a crippling effect on researchers in this emerging field." It further says, it relates to the cord bill, in essence: "It seems extremely unlikely that adult blood cells or blood

cells from the umbilical cord will be therapeutically useful as a source of anything else but blood.”

Mr. Speaker, there are few families that I know that have not been impacted by a myriad of these diseases. We need help. We need to find a cure, and that is why we need to support both pieces of legislation this afternoon.

THE STEM CELL DEBATE
(By David A. Shaywitz)

Perhaps the most underrated achievement of the modern conservative movement has been a renewed appreciation for the danger of “junk science”—unsubstantiated scientific research that is exploited for political gain. How sad, then, that in the ongoing debate over stem cell research, many conservatives have chosen to abandon their well-founded skepticism and to embrace dubious but convenient data for the sake of advancing their cause.

The latest tempest has emerged from remarkably modest congressional legislation, proposed by Republican MICHAEL CASTLE and Democrat DIANA DEGETTE and scheduled for a vote today, which would permit federal funds to be used on human embryonic stem cell lines derived after Aug. 9, 2001. Presently, only the few lines established prior to this date are eligible for government support, a prohibition that has had a crippling effect on research in this emerging field.

Human embryonic stem cells have the potential to develop into any adult cell type. If this process of specialization could be achieved in the lab, scientists might be able to create replacement pancreas cells for diabetics, or neurons for patient with Parkinson's Disease; these treatments are likely many years away.

For some opponents of embryonic stem cell science, the argument is fundamentally one of faith: The human embryo should be held as sacrosanct, and not used for the pursuit of any ends, regardless of how nobly intended. The trouble for such dogmatic critics of embryonic stem cell research is that most Americans hold a less extreme position; given a choice between discarding frozen, excess embryos from in vitro fertilization clinics or allowing the cells to be used for medical research—specifically, the generation of new embryonic stem cell lines—most of us would choose the second. Consequently, conservative stem cell opponents have now begun to argue in earnest that embryonic stem cell research is not just morally wrong, but also unnecessary, an argument that relies on suspect science and appears motivated by even more questionable principles.

First, the science: Opponents of the Castle-DeGette legislation assert that embryonic stem cells are unnecessary because adult stem cells, as well as umbilical cord blood stem cells, will perform at least as well as embryonic stem cells, and have already demonstrated their therapeutic value. This argument appears very popular, and has been articulated by almost every member of Congress who has spoken out against the new stem cell bill.

To be sure, one of the great successes of modern medicine has been the use of adult blood stem cells to treat patients with leukemia. The trouble is generalizing from this: There are very strong data suggesting that while blood stem cells are good at making new blood cells, they are not able to turn into other types of cells, such as pancreas or brain. The limited data purported to demonstrate the contrary are preliminary, inconclusive, unsubstantiated, or all three. Thus, it seems extremely unlikely that adult blood cells—or blood cells from the umbilical

cord—will be therapeutically useful as a source of anything else but blood.

Moreover, while stem cells seem to exist for some cell types in the body—the blood and the intestines, for example—many adult tissues such as the pancreas, may not have stem cells at all. Thus, relying on adult stem cells to generate replacement insulin-producing cells for patients with diabetes is probably an exercise in futility.

For true believers, of course, these scientific facts should be beside the point; if human embryonic stem cell research is morally, fundamentally, wrong, then it should be wrong, period, regardless of the consequences to medical research. If conservatives believe their own rhetoric, they should vigorously critique embryonic stem cell research on its own grounds, and not rely upon an appeal to utilitarian principles.

Instead, there has been a concerted effort to establish adult stem cells as a palatable alternative to embryonic stem cells. In the process, conservatives seem to have left their usual concern for junk science at the laboratory door, citing in their defense preliminary studies and questionable data that they would surely—and appropriately—have ridiculed were it not supporting their current point of view. In fact, there is little credible evidence to suggest adult stem cells have the same therapeutic potential as embryonic stem cells. Conservatives often speak of the need to abide by difficult principle; acknowledging the limitations of adult stem cell research would seem like a good place to start.

Human embryonic stem cell research represents one of the most important scientific frontiers, and also one of the most controversial: Our national debate on it deserves to be informed by our loftiest ethical aspirations—but also grounded in our most rigorous scientific standards.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, could I inquire as to the time on all sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) has 3½ minutes; the gentleman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) has 7 minutes; the majority leader has 8 minutes; the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) has 6 minutes; and the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) has 3¼ minutes.

The order of closing will be the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) first; the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) second; the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) third; the gentleman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) fourth; and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) last.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this bill and support the President's position on embryonic stem cells.

Let's be clear. Embryonic stem cell research is legal in America today, and nothing in the administration's current policy has affected the legality of this research. The administration's policy simply provides that Federal taxpayer dollars not be used to destroy human embryos. I believe most Americans, when they understand this, agree with the administration. But this rule does not in any way limit the private sector from pursuing embryonic stem cell research.

□ 1700

But ultimately, Mr. Speaker, no one can deny that this debate involves profound ethical and moral questions. This is a matter of conscience for millions of Americans who are deeply troubled by the idea of their own funds being used to destroy another human life. For many of my colleagues, and for me, this is a vote of conscience.

Let the private sector go forward, if it must, with the destruction of embryos for ethically questionable science. But spend the people's money on proven blood cord, bone marrow and adult stem cell research.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER).

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, in Missouri's 5th District there are two individuals, Jim and Virginia Stowers, who did not seek a Federal grant, but who used \$2 billion of their own money to begin some very vital research. They founded the Stowers Institute. And the Stowers Institute employs brilliant researchers from more than 20 countries around the world, and they are working with the most advanced tools to answer the questions and build the bridges between diseases and cures.

Our Nation is blessed with the greatest minds and researchers on this planet. But to whom much is given, much is required. And so, Mr. Speaker, this Nation has a wonderful opportunity right now to respond to the needs and the interests of its people.

Two boys, twin boys were in bed. One fell out of the bed in the middle of the morning, and when the parents went in to see him and asked what happened, he said, as he looked up to the bed, I think I was sleeping too close to where I got in. And that is where we are, Mr. Speaker. Even after the President has spoken, we are, as a Nation, still sleeping too close to where we got in with regard to research on stem cells.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, could I inquire of the gentleman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) how many speakers they each have left? I have four, actually five, counting me.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I am intending to reserve the rest of my time for closing.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I have one more speaker and then I plan on closing.

Mr. DELAY. With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER).

(Mr. NEUGEBAUER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 810, but in strong support of adult stem cell research as it respects life.

An embryo is a human at its earliest stage of life and deserves the same respect that we give infants, adolescents and adults.

During this debate, some would attempt to justify embryonic stem cell

research on the basis that we are dealing with something other than real human beings. We use the words stem cell, but we could also use the words Nathan and Noah. These are justifications based on definitions of life that are purely arbitrary.

Indeed, a human at the embryonic stage may look a little different than a human at the adult stage, but that does not make the embryo any less a human. The embryo possesses the genetic identity as it will as an adult. It is merely at an earlier stage in life.

Just as we find it unconscionable and unethical to exploit human life in the name of science during the latter stages of life, neither should we accept the exploitation of human life at its earliest stages.

Instead, we should focus our resources on supporting medical research such as cord blood and adult stem cell research that respect human lives and have an actual track record of creating cures.

Vote against H.R. 810.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, as we debate this proposal, we cannot ignore the fact that every human life begins as a human embryo. Sadly, passage of this bill will put the government and taxpayers in the position of sanctioning and funding the destruction of that human life.

Now, we all feel strongly about the need for aggressive and advanced research to cure and combat the myriad of diseases that prematurely take the lives of our friends and our family members and our fellow citizens. When we lost my father to cancer, our family certainly wished that medical breakthroughs had come sooner.

That is why I am so supportive of the rapid progress being made in the fields of adult and umbilical cord stem cell research. Cord blood stem cells have already been used to treat patients, we have been hearing, for up to 67 diseases, and it is my understanding they have the potential to become any kind of cell, similar to what embryonic stem cells do.

While I recognize that many proponents of this bill offer their support with good intentions, in this case we do have clear alternatives, and I would strongly urge my colleagues to support adult and umbilical and reject this bill.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I would yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY).

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I was recently asked by a kind and gentle lady my position on stem cell research. This is always a difficult question. But I told her, I am in favor of stem cell research, research that uses stem cells from cord blood and adult stem cell sources, research that is already showing great medical promise and avoids the ethically divisive issue of the destruction of an unborn human embryo, an unborn human person.

Frankly, I did not know how she would respond. And she went on to tell me that she had MS herself. And she told me that if research found a cure using unborn human embryos, that she would not take that cure, that she could not in her conscience take that cure that sacrificed a human life.

Mr. Speaker, let us set a new standard, one that aggressively promotes good research to help the sick and injured, one that respects the consciences of tens of millions of Americans who do not wish to see their tax dollars used in the destruction of unborn human life, one that supports a consistent life ethic and gives true hope to those who are suffering in our communities.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE).

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I do rise today in strong support of H.R. 810.

Over the past two decades, three-quarters of the scientists who have won the Nobel Prize in medicine have studied or taught in the United States. And this is not a coincidence. Our Nation has created an environment that values innovation and discovery, especially in biological sciences. H.R. 810 will help America continue to lead in this crucial field.

Of course, there is more at stake in this debate than America's global standing. Stem cell research holds extraordinary potential to save lives and alleviate human suffering. I had a father who suffered from Parkinson's, a mother who passed away with Alzheimer's. And I am all the more convinced that we must pursue this research vigorously, because I believe it does have potential to yield results.

I would argue that H.R. 810 is worthy of our support not just for what it allows but for what it restricts. The bill requires that embryos be in excess of clinical need. It does not permit financial compensation for those embryos, and it requires the donor's written, informed consent.

This legislation appeals to hope, but it insists on caution as well. H.R. 810 is as thoughtful as it is ambitious. For that reason I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I only have one more speaker before I close. So I yield, Mr. Speaker, 3½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), who has been fighting for the culture of life his entire career. I am very honored to yield to him.

(Mr. HYDE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, the reason this vote is so important is simply because the embryo is human life. It is not animal, it is not vegetable, it is not mineral, but a tiny, microscopic beginning of a human life.

Everyone in this room was an embryo at one time. I, myself, am a 192-month-old embryo. The question we face is how much respect is due to this

tiny little microscopic human life. If we are truly pro-life, we should protect it rather than treat it as a thing to be experimented with.

Lincoln asked a very haunting question at a small military cemetery in Pennsylvania. He asked whether a Nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal can long endure? And that question has to be answered by every generation.

What is wrong with this legislation? The motives of its sponsors are so noble. Well, I will tell you two things that are fatally wrong with this legislation. The first one is, for the first time in our national history, taxpayers' dollars are going to be spent for the killing of innocent human life. That is number one. And number two, this bill tramples on the moral convictions of an awful lot of people who do not want their tax dollars going to be spent for killing innocent human life.

Americans paid a terrible price for not recognizing the humanity of Dred Scott. We are going to pay a terrible price for not recognizing the humanity of these little embryos. We should not go down that road.

In World War II, 1940, before America got in the war, there was a publication called the Yearbook of Obstetrics and Gynecology. And Dr. Joseph DeLee wrote in that yearbook something that applies to us today. Here is what he wrote. "At the present time, when rivers of blood and tears of innocent men and women are flowing in most parts of the world, it seems almost silly to be contending over the right to life of an unknowable atom of human flesh in the uterus of a woman.

"No, it is not silly. On the contrary, it is of transcendent importance that there be in this chaotic world one high spot, however small, which is safe against the deluge of immorality and savagery that is sweeping over us.

"That we, in the medical profession, hold to the principle of the sacredness of human life and the rights of the individual, even though unborn, is proof that humanity is not yet lost."

I believe humanity is not yet lost, and this vote will tell us the answer to that question.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and I commend the gentleman for his leadership on this issue.

We have heard a lot of discussion of the three known forms of stem cell therapies that are hypothesized to treat all these diseases. One of the nice things about adult stem cell treatments and why I think they have been embraced, and part of the reason they have been so successful is, if you use a cell from your own body, there are no tissue rejection concerns.

If you use a cord blood or placental blood stem cell, there are tissue rejection concerns; but it is felt by the advocates of the gentleman from New

Jersey (Mr. SMITH's) bill, such as myself, that by obtaining the bank, we would be able to enter all of your genetic information and come up with a match. And one of the questions I have for my colleagues who have been an advocate for the Castle/DeGette bill is, how, if these embryonic cells were ever proven to be useful, and that has yet to be demonstrated in the literature, how would you override the tissue rejection concerns?

Mr. Speaker, it takes us to a very important part of this debate that we really have not dwelled on very much. They say there are 400,000 embryos in the freezers, but the truth is the vast majority of those embryos are wanted, and their own studies suggest only 275 cell lines will be available if this bill becomes law.

Mr. Speaker, the place we are going to have to go to make embryonic stem cell work, if it ever can be demonstrated to work, is creating human embryos for this purpose. And that really brings me to my point. If you are going to go down the road of creating human embryos, you really only have two options. You are going to need tens of thousands of women to donate their eggs, or you are going to have to clone. And that is why people like myself have been saying, wait to see what is next, because that is going to be the next debate.

□ 1715

If this becomes law, we are going to be asked to embrace Federal funding for creating human life for this research. No longer using the so-called excess embryos, but either exploiting women for their eggs or worse, we are going down the path of cloning. And I assure you, if you find those options objectionable, they will be cloaked with the same kind of arguments that have been used to support this bill. People will say it is for the purpose of helping the sick and suffering. And what I have been saying over and over again, if you actually read the medical journals, the promise and the potential appear to be in the ethically acceptable alternatives of adult stem research and cord blood research.

Reject this bill. Vote "no" on Castle/DeGette.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I make a simple plea to save lives by supporting H.R. 810, the DeGette/Castle bill, and to help Americans who are suffering. I ask for a "yes" vote on H.R. 810 simply to save lives.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 810, the "Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act of 2005." As a supporter of the bill, I would argue that it is necessary to expand the number of stem cell lines that can be used in

federally funded research in order to accelerate scientific progress toward the cures and treatments for a wide variety of diseases and debilitating health conditions—including Parkinson's Disease, diabetes, Alzheimer's Disease, ALS, cancer, and spinal cord injuries.

According to the National Institutes of Health, NIH, of the 78 stem cell lines that were declared eligible for Federal funding in 2001, only about 22 lines are actually available for study by and distribution to researchers. Further, NIH concludes that these stem cell lines are contaminated with "mouse feeder" cells, making their therapeutic use for humans uncertain. These NIH-approved lines lack the genetic diversity that researchers need in order to create effective treatments for millions of Americans.

H.R. 810 would expand the number of stem cell lines that would be made available under strict ethical guidelines. The stem cells would be derived from excess frozen fertilized embryos that would otherwise be discarded. It is estimated that there are currently about 400,000 frozen IVF embryos, which would be destroyed if they are not donated for research. The embryos could be used only if the donors give their informed, written consent and receive no money or other inducement in exchange for their embryos.

It is important for me to note that it is simply not true that adult stem cells offer the same, or better, potential for treating disease as embryonic stem cells. While embryonic stem cells have qualities that give them the potential to treat a wide variety of diseases and injuries, adult stem cells do not have those same qualities. Unlike embryonic stem cells, adult stem cells cannot be induced to develop into any type of cell. Furthermore, adult stem cells may not exist for certain tissues, and adult stem cells are difficult to identify, purify, and grow.

Unless Federal funding for stem cell research is expanded, the United States stands in real danger of falling behind other countries in this promising area of research. Researchers have already moved to other countries, such as Great Britain, which have more supportive policies. The recent announcement that South Korean researchers have produced cloned human embryos that are genetic twins of patients with various diseases, and have derived stem cells from them, shows just how far that country is going. While it is important to recognize that this bill has nothing to do with cloning, it is also important to recognize that other countries are moving ahead in stem cell research.

This bill provides a limited—but nonetheless highly significant—change in current policy that would result in making many more lines of stem cells available for research. It would do so under strict ethical guidelines. The measure has widespread bipartisan support. Passage of this bill would provide hope for those millions of Americans suffering from diseases that may be treated or even cured as a result of stem cell research.

Before concluding, I would just mention that the National Academy of Sciences, NAS, recently issued a set of guidelines to ensure that human embryonic stem cell research is conducted in a safe and ethical manner. Because of the limitations of the current federal policy, only 22 stem cell lines are eligible for federal research and fall under the jurisdiction of National Institutes of Health guidelines. Specifically, H.R. 810 requires that:

The stem cells must be derived from human embryos that were donated from in vitro fertilization clinics, and that were created for the purpose of fertility treatment, but were in excess of the clinical need of the people seeking such treatment;

The embryos would not have been used for fertility treatment, and would otherwise be discarded;

The individuals seeking fertility treatment donated the embryos with informed written consent and without any financial payment or other inducement to make the donation.

In addition, the bill requires that not later than 60 days after enactment, HHS, in consultation with the National Institutes of Health, issue final guidelines to carry out the requirements of this bill. Finally, the measure requires HHS to report annually to Congress on the activities carried out under this bill. The report must include a description of whether, and to what extent, these activities were carried out in accordance with the requirements of this bill.

In closing, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 810.

Listen to the following news reports which indicate this research as viable and of great need for so many.

Since the federal government's science officials have abdicated their traditional role in setting ethical rules for medical experimentation, the National Academy of Sciences has filled the void with useful guidelines for research with human embryonic stem cells. Acting on behalf of scientists around the country, the NAS last week issued stem cell research guidelines that should become a blueprint for ethical behavior in both the public and private sector. *The Atlanta Journal Constitution*, May 3, 2005.

Kudos to the National Academy of Sciences for ably filling the breach caused by the absence of federal guidelines on human embryonic stem cell research. While we prefer that rules governing research on human tissues be federal and enforceable, the National Academy of Sciences' new voluntary guidelines are a necessary stand-in. *The Baltimore Sun*, May 3, 2005.

With the federal government's role limited, research has been proceeding without clear, consistent guidelines . . . These and other recommendations are a good start toward ensuring that stem cell research is conducted in an ethical way. . . The federal government is still not doing all that it should, but these recommendations ought at least to help the private companies and states that are moving ahead with research that offers so much hope for many Americans. *The Winston-Salem Journal*, May 3, 2005.

The National Academy of Sciences gave a much needed boost to embryonic stem cell research last week when it issued ethics guidelines that should help researchers find a clear path through a minefield of controversial issues. . . they will give practicing scientists the assurance that they can proceed with their work while adhering to principles endorsed by a panel of distinguished scientists, ethicist, and others. *The New York Times*, May 2, 2005.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank both the Republican and Democratic leadership for allowing this to take place here today.

Sometimes there are issues of such critical social importance that it is

only right that the Congress of the United States do this in the open, and they did that and for that we should all be very appreciative.

I just want to leave my colleagues with some closing thoughts, perhaps some of the things I started with. There are 110 million people just in the United States of America out of 290 million who have some sort of illness that potentially could be helped by the use of embryonic stem cells. Most of those will never be helped by the use of adult stem cells. We know that anything other than just the use of adult stem cells in blood tissues has been experimental at best and probably will never work.

I would encourage everyone to use their conscience as they vote today, to think about their constituents at home. We talk about life, and I do not necessarily want to get into that argument back and forth, but the bottom line is there are a lot of lives that are being foreshortened in the United States of America and across the world that perhaps could be lived out to their fullest if that opportunity was given to the individuals involved.

Remember that this research is going on at the private sector level. It is also going on at the State level. It is even going on to a degree at the Federal level. There has been \$60 million spent over 3 years on this research at the Federal level, and about \$625 million has been spent on adult stem cells at the Federal level. So the research is going on at the time.

Our ethic standards in this bill, and if you read it, it is only 3 pages long, exceed any ethical standards that have ever existed before including what the President had before.

The National Institutes of Health said: "Human embryonic stem cells are thought to have much greater developmental potential than adult stem cells. This means that embryonic stem cells may be pluripotent, that is, able to give rise to cells found in all tissues of the embryo except for germ cells rather than being merely multipotent, restricted to specific subpopulations of cell types, as adult stem cells are thought to be."

That is where the science is. You can argue all you want, but if you do any extensive reading on this, that is where the science is. These are the stem cells which can make a difference, the embryonic stem cells.

There are discussions of dollars. There are no dollars used directly in the destruction of embryos at an in vitro fertilization clinic. There are dollars used in the research ultimately. But let us look at that. Let us consider what that is all about.

At the end, when those who have created the embryo make the decision that they no longer need or want that particular embryo, the physician has to make a decision about what to do with it. There are some options there. Not a lot of options. One of them is to give that particular embryo up for

adoption. Some people do not choose to do that. There have only been fewer than 100 so far. And I think that is wonderful. I think that option should be offered.

Some people may make other decisions, but basically it will be one of two decisions if this legislation passes. One is to put it into hospital waste, warm it up to room temperature, thereby destroying it at that point and doing it that way, or to be giving it up for research. And my judgment is if that is a decision, why are we not helping the 110 million people out there who need help, as opposed to allowing this to go to hospital waste because it will happen anyhow.

If you do not like that, you better go out and lobby against what they are doing in in vitro fertilization clinics, and I do not think that we want to do that.

There are about 400,000 of these embryos. That is probably a low estimate today. That is an estimate of about 3 years ago. About 2 percent are given up a year. That is 8,000. The numbers that are more limited than that are just wrong. A lot of people now, if this passes, are going to be offered the opportunity to give up the embryo for research instead of hospital waste, and they are going to make that decision, and we will get the kind of work that we need.

I would just close by saying that 14 out of the 15 diseases that are most likely to kill people in the world are not ever going to be helped by adult stem cells. We need to do this. With your vote today you can provide hope to tens of millions of Americans and many more around the world. Support H.R. 810.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of discussion today about the quality of adult stem cells and they are not as versatile as embryonic stem cells. There are a number of things that show adult stem cells are highly versatile and just as effective if not more effective than the predicted embryonic stems.

The list of these studies is as follows:
Myth: Adult Stem Cells are Not as Versatile as Embryonic stem cells.

Fact: A number of studies show adult stem cells are highly Versatile.

1. Professor Alan Mackay-Sim of Griffith University in Australia published a study showing that olfactory stem cells could develop into heart cells, liver cells, kidney cells, muscle cells, brain cells and nerve cells. (Murrell W et al., "Multipotent stem cells from adult olfactory mucosa", *Developmental Dynamics* published online 21 March 2005.)

2. Dr. Douglas Losordo at Tufts University showed that a type of bone marrow stem cell can turn into most tissue types, and can regenerate damaged heart. "This discovery represents a major breakthrough in stem-cell therapy," said Dr. Douglas Losordo. "Based on our findings we believe these

newly discovered stem-cells may have the capacity to generate into most tissue types in the human body. This is a very unique property that until this time has only been found in embryonic stem cells." (Yoon Y-s et al., "Clonally expanded novel multipotent stem cells from human bone marrow regenerate myocardium after myocardial infarction", *Journal of Clinical Investigation* 115, 326-338, February 2005.)

3. In July 2004, research conducted in Germany, led by Dr. Peter Wernet found a type of umbilical cord blood stem cell, they call USSC's (unrestricted somatic stem cells), that they showed can turn into several different cell types, including brain, bone, cartilage, liver, heart, and blood cells. It showed that the cells can turn into all three germ layers, showing they are pluripotent. (Kogler G et al., "A new human somatic stem cell from placental cord blood with intrinsic pluripotent differentiation potential", *J. Experimental Medicine* 200, 123-135, 19 July 2004.)

4. In June 2004, researchers showed that human bone marrow stem cells have pluripotent potential. (D'Ippolito G et al., "Marrow-isolated adult multilineage inducible (MIAMI) cells, a unique population of postnatal young and old human cells with extensive expansion and differentiation potential", *J. Cell Science* 117, 2971-2981, 15 July 2004 (published online 1 June 2004))

5. This study shows that blood stem cells can form cells from all 3 primary germ layers, including endothelial cells, neuronal cells, and liver cells. (Zhao Y et al.; "A human peripheral blood monocyte-derived subset acts as pluripotent stem cells"; *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA* 100, 2426-2431; 4 March 2003)

6. Researchers found bone marrow stem cells in females that received transplants from male donors. Researchers found the Y chromosome in the brain, showing that bone marrow stem cells generated neurons. (Mezey E et al.; "Transplanted bone marrow generates new neurons in human brains"; *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA* 100, 1364-1369; 4 Feb 2003)

7. Another group of researchers showed that bone marrow stem cells can form all body tissues. (Jiang Y et al.; "Pluripotency of mesenchymal stem cells derived from adult marrow"; *Nature* 418, 41-49; 4 July 2002)

8. In 2002, Catherine Verfaillie has turned these bone marrow stem cells into skin, brain, lungs, heart, retina, muscle, intestines, kidney and spleen. University of Minnesota researchers found a certain type of bone marrow stem cell (called a multipotent adult progenitor cells (MAPCs)) that could be turned into the three primary germ layers (endoderm, ectoderm, ectoderm and mesoderm). (Nature advance online publication, 23 June 2002 (doi: 10.1038/nature 00870))

9. A single adult mouse bone marrow stem cell can form functional marrow, blood cells, liver, lung, gastrointestinal tract, skin, heart and skeletal muscle according to researchers Dr. Neil Theise of NY Univ. School of Medicine and Dr. Diane Krause of Yale Univ. School of Medicine (Krause DS et al.; "Multi-Organ, Multi-Lineage Engraftment by a Single Bone Marrow-Derived Stem Cell"; *Cell* 105, 369-377; 4 May 2001)

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of arguments. In fact, we just heard again that in fact we throw these cells away when we are done. We do not want them. There is nothing we can do with them so we should use them for medical research or else it will just be medical waste.

I must ask again, is that what we have come to as a Nation that in viewing embryos, that if allowed to grow

and divide could become human beings but we will just treat them as human waste?

The proponents of H.R. 810 are so adamant that we do research specifically using embryonic stem cells. And why embryonic stem cells? Because they are the best hope according to proponents of finding cures. They say medical science can unlock these keys to life. We can cure any illness, any disease, or any injury.

The proponents argue we must create life, the embryo, and then destroy the embryo through research to unlock the mysteries of life; create and clone the building blocks of life so we can manipulate and experiment. I believe as a country and as a culture that is a line we should not cross.

We heard today about other research with adult stem cells, cord, placenta, bone marrow, fetal tissue, and how about unraveling our DNA through the mapping of the genome, all in the pursuit of finding medical cures.

But where do we draw a line on medical research and say we as a Nation, as a people, will not cross that line? This question has not been adequately addressed in this legislation.

When do embryos become life? We have heard all kinds of figures today. After 40 hours? That is less than 2 days after fertilization when we are able to check embryos for division and fertilization. Or is it 5 days when the embryos may be called blastocysts? At this stage, they are approximately 250 cells. Or do we allow the blastocysts to survive in the laboratory culture for up to 14 days and still then not call them human life, but blastocysts so they are open to experiment and research?

When does life become scientifically non-existent? That is the question as elected representatives we have not yet answered. H.R. 810 does not answer that. Vote "no" on H.R. 810.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, what we have before us today is not a debate as some have suggested between science and ideology, but between aspirations and actions. Both sides of this debate wish to ease human suffering.

So what divides us is not our ends, but the means to which we would resort to pursue those ends. That is why the Castle bill must be defeated, because while we are motivated by our aspirations, we are defined by our actions; and the Federal Government simply cannot sanction the actions authorized and funded by this legislation.

For all the arguments we have heard today, scientific, ethical, political, the debate for and against the Castle bill, for and against the authorization of Federal taxpayer dollars to fund medical research predicated on the destruction of human embryos is in essence a question of the level of respect and dignity our government chooses to grant human life in its earliest stage. That embryos are human beings is not a political dispute. An embryo is a person,

a distinct, internally directed, self-integrating human organism. An embryo has not merely the potential to become a human being. It is one, and as such, just like a newborn or a toddler or a teenager, possesses instead the internally directed potential to grow into adulthood, to become in a sense what he or she already is.

An embryo is whole, just unfinished, just like the rest of us. We were all at one time embryos ourselves, and so was Abraham, so was Mohammed, so was Jesus of Nazareth and Shakespeare and Beethoven and Lincoln. And so were the 79 children, those snowflake children, those snowflake children ages 6 and under who have been adopted. Do not throw them away. Adopt them.

These children have been adopted through different programs, but particularly the Snowflake Embryo Adoption Program, who under the Castle bill and its predictable progeny might otherwise have been destroyed in a petri dish, these children that were embryos.

An embryo is nothing less than a human being, a fact both morally intuited and scientifically unquestioned. What level of respect and dignity, then, should our government grant such little creatures, these tiny beings who our eyes suggest are not like us but who our hearts and minds know in fact are us?

The Castle bill is very clear, and though I oppose it, its clarity well serves both sides in this debate. The Castle bill says essentially that the potential medical and scientific progress represented by an embryo's stem cells justifies taxpayer funding for the destruction of that embryo through the harvesting of the stem cells.

Of course, it is not the hoped-for end of the Castle bill that we oppose, nor necessarily, among some on this side of the aisle, even its destructive means, but instead the entitlement of those destructive means to Federal tax dollars.

After all, human embryos are being harvested for medical research every day in this country. We just do not think the government should be forcing the American people to pay for it, especially considering the discouraging track record of the kind of research the Castle bill has in mind.

To date, Mr. Speaker, none, none, not one of the countless and extraordinarily well-endowed private embryonic-cell-harvesting projects has yielded a single treatment for a single disease. Not one.

Embryonic stem cell therapies which are by design definitely untherapeutic to the embryos have in fact proven to be similarly harmful to those patients the treatments were supposed to help.

Harvested embryonic stem cells are typically rejected by the host patient and often form cancerous tumors as a byproduct of that rejection. That is to say, Mr. Speaker, it does not work.

And, indeed, many embryonic stem cell experts concede that such research

will not yield results for decades, if at all, if ever. In truth, then, it is not the ends that would supposedly justify the grizzly means of the Castle bill, but the mere aspiration to those ends.

On the other hand, better developed stem cells from the umbilical cords of newborn babies and the bone marrow of fully grown adults have led to treatments of no fewer than 67 separate diseases.

Based on this successful track record, the biomedical industry is pouring its own money into adult stem cell research. It is the smart investment.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the Castle bill would throw taxpayer money at the same unsuccessful research that companies with the financial motivation for developing such research are avoiding. It just does not work.

Indeed, one might say the stubborn advocacy of embryonic harvesting in the face of the overwhelming clinical evidence of its futility might be a genuine case of ideology trumping science.

But what if it did work, Mr. Speaker? What if all the Utopian comments of the Castle bill's proponents were to come true? What then?

□ 1730

What if we could be sure that government-funded destruction of human embryos could do all the things we are asked to believe? Well, in that case, Mr. Speaker, we would still be right to oppose it because in the life of men and nations, some mistakes you cannot undo. Some mistakes do not just come back and haunt you, they define you.

A decision by our government to sanction embryo harvesting here at the very dawn of the biotechnology age could come to own us, for the paltry research sum envisioned by the Castle bill is but the first generation, the first drop of the deluge. Its offspring will ultimately include cloning, genetically engineered children, a black market of human body parts, and a global economy organized around the exploitation and hyper-ovulation of impoverished women and girls for their eggs.

If the mere aspiration of ends justify the means here, in our first ethical challenge of the biotechnology age, how could we hope for a higher standard the next time? Which returns me to the irreducible question of this debate: What level of respect and dignity ought this government grant defenseless unburdensome human life at its earliest, most vulnerable stage?

Given the biological fact of a human embryo's membership in the human family, given the technological necessity of embryonic destruction as a precondition of embryonic stem cell research, given the medical reality of embryonic stem cell research's consistent therapeutic failure, given the moral catastrophe of means-justifying-the-ends morality, and given the physical revulsion people instinctively feel when considering the destruction of defenseless human life by scientists in lab coats; given all these factors, the

answer a proponent of taxpayer-funded embryonic stem cell harvesting and research must give is "none." For if we afford the little embryos any shred of respect and dignity, we cannot in good faith use taxpayer dollars to destroy them.

I wish there was another way, Mr. Speaker, but there is not. It is just wrong, not as a matter of ideology or even fate, but as a matter of respect and dignity.

We are not asking anyone here to recognize the rights of human embryos, but the wrongs of human adults. This is not about the embryo's standing as a juridical person, but our standing as moral persons. Because the choice to protect a human embryo from federally funded destruction is not ultimately about the embryos, it is about us and our rejection of the treacherous notion that while all human lives are sacred, some are more sacred than others. I heard it said here today, Some are more sacred than others.

Like our embryonic cousins, Mr. Speaker, our Nation is whole but unfinished. The issue is a test in which we are asked out of good and pure intentions just this once, just this tiny little bit, to let the ends justify the means, to let the noble aspirations justify ignoble actions.

In this test, in this vote, then, we have an opportunity today to speak truth to the power of biotechnology, to rise up against the prevailing winds of human excess and hold fast to the dignity of human life upon which all other worldly truths are based: to ensure our appetite for knowledge is checked by our knowledge of our appetites; to stand up, as only America can, in the name of the least among us, whom we serve, and become the people we are.

I ask my colleagues, seize the opportunity and vote "no."

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, first I would like to give my heartfelt thanks to my partner, the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), our bipartisan whip team, the 201 cosponsors of this bill, and so many others who spoke today from the bottom of their hearts.

More than 100 years ago, Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes recognized that we are living in an increasingly complex world and that "the chief worth of civilization is just that it makes the means of living more complex." This world, he says, "calls for great and combined intellectual efforts instead of simple, uncoordinated ones."

The truth of Justice Holmes' words in today's complex world is best seen in the state of scientific research. We are on the verge of breakthroughs that will cure diseases that affect tens of millions of Americans. Yet some want to turn away from this potential, to refuse to even acknowledge its existence, simply because they do not understand the complexity of this issue. This refusal is slowing the process of ethical science and, worse, delaying ad-

vancements that could cure diseases that affect patients and families around the world.

Our constituents want more from us. They want their elected officials to thoughtfully examine tough issues like embryonic stem cell research, and create policies that address both practical and ethical challenges. They also expect us to consider these issues not as Democrats or as Republicans, not as pro-life or pro-choice, but as people with family members and friends whose lives could be made better or even saved by our decisions.

Passing H.R. 810 will allow the Federal Government to enable scientists, not politicians, to determine whether embryonic stem cell research will lead to cures for diseases that now plague us, and it will do so while establishing the clear and strict ethical guidelines that are absent today.

In 2001, the President issued his executive order establishing the current embryonic stem cell research policy in an attempt to balance bioethics and science. In the last 4 years, it has become clear that the policy has failed on both counts. Research has been stymied in this country, going into private hands and offshore. Research moves ahead, but not with the resources and coordination of the National Institutes of Health and without clear ethical standards.

I recognize that new science creates new moral dilemmas. That is why our bill sets explicit controls on how stem cell lines can be created. It gives another option for embryos created for in vitro fertilization, embryos created in petri dishes, that would otherwise be destroyed so that they can be used to potentially save or extend lives. It gives the patients for whom the embryos are created the decision on how they will be used: as now, freezing for possible future use; discarding them as medical waste or donating them to other couples for implantation; and if this bill passes, another option, donating them for critical research that could save millions of lives of people who are already born.

Here is why we need to pass this bill. These are two young brothers from Denver, Colorado. Wyatt and Noah Forman. Both of these boys have Type 1 diabetes, and both of them have been diagnosed since they were 2. A couple of months ago, little Noah had convulsions in the middle of the night from low blood sugar. His parents thought they would lose him, and now they cannot sleep at night. Without a cure, Wyatt and Noah face possible complications ranging from a heart attack to kidney failure or even blindness as they grow up.

How can we tell these boys, these two boys and millions of others, that we would rather throw the embryonic stem cells that could provide them a cure than to allow them to be donated for science? How can we tell our colleagues, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) and the gentleman

from Illinois (Mr. EVANS), our mothers with Alzheimer's, our brothers with Lou Gehrig's disease, the millions of Americans who are praying for a cure and for whom embryonic stem cell research may hold the key, Sorry, the Federal Government is opting out?

Let us not let 1 more year, 1 more month, or 1 more day go by without acting. Let us reclaim the Federal Government's role as the leader in ethical basic research. Let us give those whom we are sworn to represent hope. Let us pass H.R. 810.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

(Mr. DENT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 810.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on behalf of H.R. 810, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act of 2005.

Today there have been bills presented that discuss, among other things, the merits of embryonic stem cell study versus cord blood cell utilization. This discussion, while interesting, misses the point of promoting stem cell research in general: Scientific breakthroughs that may originate from stem cell examination have the power to better, and even save the lives of our fellow citizens afflicted with terrible diseases. Stem cell research holds out hope for those suffering with, for example, diabetes, Parkinson's, and coronary heart disease, the number one killer of adults in this country. We must encourage this research, and the legislation offered by my colleagues from New Jersey and Delaware is an important step forward in our attempts to find cures for these diseases.

Moreover, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act promotes the establishment of ethical standards with regard to the procurement of embryos utilized in the research. The only embryos that can be utilized are ones that were originally created for fertility treatment purposes and are in excess of clinical need. Further, the individuals seeking fertility treatments for whom those embryos were created have determined that these embryos will not be implanted in a woman and will be otherwise discarded. Finally, these same individuals have provided written consent for embryo donation.

The development of standards, both ethical and clinical, is an important aspect of stem cell research. This bill directs that the National Institutes of Health develop guidelines to insure that researchers adhere to the highest possible principles in scientific inquiry. Here we have a unique opportunity to establish national standards that will become the benchmark for scientific study throughout the world. By encouraging scientific breakthroughs while at the same time observing the highest possible standards of ethical and clinical behavior, we can go a long way towards battling genetically-based diseases that have ended the lives of so many.

Thank you Mr. Speaker, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to thank the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), for

the tenor of the debate today and for granting extended time and making sure all points of view have been heard on this important issue.

Although I am going to vote for Castle/DeGette, I do not necessarily speak as an advocate for its passage as much as I want to speak about why I have decided to vote for it.

I respect Members on both sides of this issue. I made sure that members of the committee I chair, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, regardless of their position, had an opportunity to speak and put their comments on the record.

I come at this as a 100 percent pro-life, lifetime, voting Member of Congress. As I said earlier, this will be my second vote this year where I have not adopted the pro-life position. So I am not quite 100 percent any more, but I would think that 99.8 percent over 21 years qualifies me as a pro-life Congressman.

I have also voted numerous times for our defense bill, where we have voted hundreds of billions of dollars to defend our Nation and put our young men and women at risk, some of them that might have to give up their lives. I have voted for many bills for our law enforcement officials, where again they may have to give up their lives to protect the common good.

Now, you might say, yes, but in those instances they were adults and they had free will and they voluntarily made a choice that they might have to sacrifice their lives.

Well, I accept and support that an embryo is a life. I agree with the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FERGUSON) that we were all embryos once. I understand that. And, obviously, at 7 days or 14 days, embryos do not have consciousness. They do not have free will. They do not have the neuro cells or brain cells to make a decision whether they want to voluntarily make a sacrifice. I understand that.

But I would say this: If they did, out of the 400,000 that we think may be in existence, if you narrow that down to the 2.8 percent that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) talked about that are probably not going to be used for reproductive purposes, if they did, would not some of them, knowing the stakes, volunteer? It only takes one, the right one, that magic silver bullet embryo that creates that magic stem cell that can be replicated into any of the 200 cell lines that make up the human body.

If I had that opportunity, might I not take advantage of it? Somebody would. And since they cannot, because they do not have consciousness, under a traditional law in this United States of America we give custody to the parents. A parent will make a decision at some point in time, or a family member will make a decision at some point in time that perhaps they do not want to put up for adoption, which is the decision I would make.

□ 1745

Why not? In addition to the cord blood bill that we have just passed, why not make it possible for some of these under the conditions in the Castle/DeGette bill for some to be used for research purposes. It does not take many. I respect those who say, no, you cannot do it at all. But I also say given a choice, let us err on the side of opportunity. That is why I am going to vote "yes."

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 810. This bipartisan legislation will enhance existing stem cell research and help our nation's scientists make significant progress toward the development of treatments for conditions affecting more than 100 million Americans.

But this is not just about Americans. For years, our country has led the world in medical advancements, and people from around the globe travel here for medical education as well as for lifesaving care. Today, the House is considering opening new lines of research—research that will help the United States retain its place as a world leader in this burgeoning new field, while helping to alleviate the pain and suffering of many around the world.

Current federal policy, put into place by President Bush on August 9, 2001, allows federal funds to be used to support research from the stem cell lines that existed on that date, but it bans the creation of additional stem cells from embryos that are stored at in vitro fertilization clinics. To many observers, this policy seemed a reasonable compromise at the time, as many scientists believed that the existing 78 stem cell lines would be available for use. In fact, only 22 lines are available and some of these were found to have been contaminated from contact with mouse "feeder" cells. In addition, the 22 available lines were developed using science that has since seen significant improvements. Scientists at the National Institutes of Health report that these lines also lack the genetic diversity necessary to perform extensive research for diseases that disproportionately affect minorities. These deficiencies decrease the overall number of opportunities available for our scientists and undermine potential progress in the stem cell field. In essence, our policy has discouraged scientific exploration by restricting the extent of research. It is wrong for Congress to tie the hands of our scientists while millions of Americans suffer.

Since the President's policy was implemented, I have heard from hundreds of Marylanders who have been diagnosed with debilitating illnesses, including leukemia, diabetes, Parkinson's disease, Alzheimer's disease, and spinal cord injuries. They are grateful for the federal research funding that Congress has provided in past years, particularly the doubling of the NIH budget over a five year period, and they look to the future with hope that more effective treatments and someday, cures, will be forthcoming.

I have also heard from the academic medical centers across the country. These are the places where the most complex medical procedures are performed, where medical school graduates from around the world are trained, where our most groundbreaking research is conducted. Two of the finest academic medical centers are located in Baltimore—the University of Maryland Medical Center and the

Johns Hopkins University Medical Center. This bill presents an opportunity to expand their ability to make life saving and life extending discoveries.

Some of my colleagues have raised ethical concerns about stem cell research, and I believe that this bill effectively addresses these concerns. The authors of this bill, Mr. CASTLE and Ms. DEGETTE, have written this legislation so as to not encourage the creation of human embryos for research or for any other purposes. This bill stipulates that all embryos used for research must have been originally created for in vitro fertilization and are in excess of clinical need; it requires that the embryos would not have been implanted and would have otherwise been discarded; and it requires donors to provide written consent before embryos may be donated for research. These guidelines are ethically sound; they help ensure that enhancing stem cell research policy will not come at the expense of respect for human life.

It is not certain that stem cell research will result in cures, but it is fairly certain that if we close off promising avenues, such as stem cell research, finding those therapies and cures will take much longer.

In 2001, two months before President Bush issued his stem cell policy, Sue Stamos and her daughter, Faith, came to visit me in my office. At the time, Faith was three years old—a very brave little girl who had been diagnosed with juvenile diabetes. Sue asked for my support for federal research to help find a cure for Faith, and I promised to do everything I could to help. Back in June of 2001, our knowledge of stem cell research's potential was nowhere near what it is now, and we did not yet know what the President would propose. Today, we have much broader and deeper knowledge about the scientific possibilities of stem cells, but much less capacity to research stem cell lines than we had anticipated. Today, I will vote to keep my promise to Sue and Faith Stamos and to the thousands of other Marylanders who are waiting for cures. I will vote to expand the stem cells lines available for federally funded research.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I must note that stem cell research is a controversial and emotional subject. It touches on questions of human suffering, medical ethics, scientific potential, the role of government, moral considerations, and life itself. H.R. 810 strikes the right balance. It encourages research, but it does not encourage the creation of embryos for research purposes. It allows us to support the efforts of the brilliant scientists in our research institutions who have dedicated their careers to alleviating the suffering of others. It allows us to honor the wishes of in vitro fertilization donors who want to make a contribution toward medical advancement. It was right for the leadership to allow a vote on this important bill, and it is right for the House to pass it.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 810.

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 810, to provide for human embryonic stem cell research. The measure is a crucial first step toward helping millions of people who suffer today from diseases that are currently without treatment. By broadening the federal government's investment in this nascent technology, I am confident that we will be able to offer help to these men, women,

and children that would be impossible by conventional means.

The room for growth in embryonic stem cell research is exponential. According to the National Institutes of Health, this work may one day be used in gene therapy and to overcome immune rejection. Heart disease, Alzheimer's, Krabbe disease and stroke are just a few of the maladies that this research could help to treat and eventually cure.

My region in Western New York has a number of great research institutes that boast a rich history of tackling devastating health afflictions. For example, Roswell Park Cancer Institute (RPCI), located in Buffalo, implemented the nation's first chemotherapy program.

RPCI's Center for Pharmacology and Therapeutics is one of few in the nation capable of all phases of drug development, from the conceptual stage through manufacturing and testing. This year, RPCI's strong basic and clinical research programs attracted major research grants and contracts totaling more than \$75 million. The Institute has sponsored or collaborated on more than 350 clinical trials of promising new cancer treatments and its developing cancer genetics program will rival the world's leading programs in that field.

The Institute has also made significant contributions to the landmark human genome project, and its new Center for Genetics and Pharmacology will adjoin the University at Buffalo's Center of Excellence in Bioinformatics and Life Sciences and the new 72,000 sq. ft, \$24 million Hauptman-Woodward Medical Research Institute building that opened less than two weeks ago. The three centers form a state-of-the-art life science cluster in downtown Buffalo that will transform lives in my district and across the world through the cutting edge stem cell and genomic research.

Western New York has made a commitment to curing disease, caring for the sick and preventing the needless loss of life wherever possible. Our innovative institutes, led by some of the best researchers in the world, can make an immeasurable difference in people's lives. It would be unconscionable, now that we are so close to the ability to use stem cells to fight off the diseases and maladies that plague us, for us to turn our backs and withhold that care. Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to pass H.R. 810. We have the tools to save lives; it is now our duty to use them.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, today the House is considering H.R. 810, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act of 2005, which expands funding for embryonic stem cell research. As an advocate of stem cell research, I'm proud to be an original cosponsor of this legislation because I believe that this critical research can lead to cures for Type 1 Diabetes, Parkinson's disease, Alzheimer's disease, paralysis caused by spinal cord injury, and other serious health problems.

Over 3,000 people die every day in the United States from diseases that may some day be treatable as a result of stem cell research. Now is the time for Congress and the Administration to recognize that the current policy does not work.

In 2001, President Bush crafted a policy to allow limited federal support for some embryonic stem cell research. Four years later, however, it's clear that his policy has hindered progress. Today, of the 78 stem cells lines approved for federal research, only 22 are available to researchers. These 22 lines are not

only contaminated but were also developed with outdated techniques.

Under H.R. 810, embryonic stem cell lines will be eligible only if embryos used to derive stem cells were originally created for fertility treatment purposes and are in excess of clinical need. Today, there are thousands of surplus embryos from fertility treatments that will never be used and will likely be discarded. We should allow parents to donate these embryos for use in federally-funded stem cell research.

This November, my home-state of California approved a \$3 billion ballot initiative supported by Governor Schwarzenegger to fund embryonic stem-cell experiments. It is the largest state-supported scientific research program. This initiative puts California at the forefront of the field and exceeds all current stem cell projects in the United States.

However, with the Federal Government on the sidelines, scientists are still reluctant to pursue stem cell research and the private sector is unwilling to invest in the field. We are losing ground to the rest of the world. As the Washington Post reported last Friday (May 20, 2005), South Korea is leapfrogging ahead of us and is developing techniques proving that stem cell research is robust.

Now, the public, researchers and industry are looking to Congress for leadership. Stem cell research should not be about politics. It should be about science, medicine and hope. We have an opportunity to help end the suffering of millions of people with chronic or terminal diseases, and we should seize it.

Stem cell research is not only critical to saving lives but it also stimulates our Nation's economy. Stem cell research is the next "big thing" in biotechnology after the human genome project. Long-term economic growth depends on productivity, productivity depends on technology, and technology ultimately depends on basic science, which is why any policy restricting federal funding for embryonic stem-cell research threatens the long-term health and vitality of the U.S. economy. Biotechnology is at a stage of development similar to where information technology was in the late 1980s—ready to explode.

For our leadership in science and technological leadership, where innovative leading-edge research is carried out matters a great deal, but under the current policy we're leaving the field even before the game has begun.

Now the President has said he will veto this bill. He may succeed in stifling stem cell research in our country, but he will not stop scientific progress. It will occur elsewhere. If the U.S. fails to embrace stem cell research, we will only slow progress in treating disease and cede our leading role as a technological leader.

The Federal Government should be in the business of encouraging and assisting research that can help save the lives of its citizens. The Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act of 2005 accelerates scientific progress toward cures and treatments for a wide range of diseases while simultaneously instituting stronger ethical requirements on stem cell lines that are eligible for federally funded research.

I urge all my colleagues in the House to support this legislation.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 810, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act, to put science and compassion ahead of ideology and fear.

The promise of embryonic stem cells is that they alone have the potential to develop into any kind of body tissue, including blood, brain, muscle, organ, or nerve tissue. Scientists believe that this unique ability might lead to breakthroughs in a number of illnesses that are now untreatable. Over 100 million Americans suffer from diseases and conditions that may one day be treated using stem cell therapies, including Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, juvenile diabetes, Lou Gehrig's disease, severe burns, and spinal cord injuries.

For the very reason that we do not yet know what kind of treatments stem cell research will yield, it would be unwise not to explore the possibilities.

As one researcher at Harvard Medical School and Boston's Children's Hospital recently wrote in the New England Journal of Medicine, "the science of human embryonic stem cells is in its infancy." Restricting stem cell research now "threaten[s] to starve the field at a critical stage." It's critical to understand the science of stem cell research to weigh the moral and ethical issues involved. This bill allows funding of research on stem cells that are harnessed from fertility clinics.

In vitro fertilization is a technology that has allowed millions of couples to share in the joy of childbirth. It results in the creation of embryos that are never implanted into the womb, never grow to be more than a handful of cells, and would otherwise be discarded. Harnessing stem cells for medical research from fertility clinics is a compassionate, pro-family, and pro-life position.

As one of the world's foremost centers of medical research, Massachusetts has much at stake in the stem cell debate. Not only are our hospitals, research facilities, and institutions of higher learning on the cutting edge of conquering disease, they are also major economic drivers keeping us competitive in the global economy and employing tens of thousands of people.

Massachusetts has over 250 biotech firms. That is more than all of Western Europe combined.

If we continue the current ban on stem cell research, it does not mean that research will stop elsewhere. But it would put America—the world's most powerful engine of innovation and progress—on the sidelines.

Mr. Speaker, America should be leading the world in using our compassion and our scientific knowledge to develop lifesaving therapies. I urge support for H.R. 810.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor of H.R. 810, I rise in support of the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act.

I want to applaud my colleagues Rep. CASTLE and Rep. DEGETTE for working together to introduce this common sense bi-partisan measure.

Mr. Speaker, we know that our population is aging. Debilitating chronic diseases like cancer, Parkinson's, Alzheimer's, and diabetes are becoming far more common.

Diabetes in particular is a huge problem, and like many other diseases, minority communities are disproportionately affected by it.

In my district in Alameda County, approximately 13.4 percent of African Americans have been diagnosed with diabetes compared to 4.5 percent of Whites. And the diabetes death rates of Latinos and African Americans are as high as 2–2.5 times those of Whites.

Expanding the number of embryonic stem cell lines available for research will assist scientists to develop therapeutic treatments and

cures for diabetes and a range of other diseases.

By passing this bill we will not only help to improve the health and well being of the public, but we will also help to eliminate future chronic health care costs and improve the health of our economy as a whole.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, it is important that I give voice to the important issue of stem cell research. This is not an issue that anyone takes lightly. Life is precious in all forms, and it is important to do all that we can to ensure issues surrounding life and quality of life are given the highest priority.

Millions of Americans suffer from debilitating diseases like Juvenile Diabetes, Parkinson's disease, Alzheimer's and a host of other diseases that reduce the quality of life or cause loss of life. Stem cells derived from embryos have shown tremendous promise in the fight to rid society of many of these diseases. In 2003 alone there were 1,681,339 deaths from diseases that could benefit from this research.

Many couples across America struggling to have children benefit from In Vitro Fertilization, a process where embryos are created to provide couples with the potential to have children. In many cases, couples have left over embryos that would be destroyed. This legislation simply provides the opportunity for those embryos to save lives already being lived.

Lives being lived by people like Tambrie Alden from Glens Falls, NY. Tambrie has had Juvenile Diabetes for 28 years. She goes through 10 daily finger sticks a day and has worn an insulin pump for 10 years. Each day brings a different battle for Tambrie; she must constantly monitor the highs and lows of her condition. Tambrie has had over 200 laser eye surgeries due to Juvenile Diabetes, which also continues to attack her organs ability to function properly.

On Sunday, Tambrie turns 47. She celebrates every birthday to the fullest, because when she was diagnosed with Juvenile Diabetes, the doctors told her she would not live past 43. Tambrie lives on borrowed time and worries about losing her sight and not being able to see her grandchildren grow up. She knows that embryonic stem cell research probably won't help her, but she prays the promise it holds will ensure that her grandchildren don't have to suffer as she has. That's why we are here today, to make sure that people like Tambrie can live their lives to the fullest.

This action is limited to promoting responsible research with embryos that would be destroyed otherwise. Congressional oversight on this ethically sensitive issue is the right balance to ensure that our nation remains diligent in our approach to medical research, while taking important steps to improve the quality of life for those who suffer from debilitating diseases.

The bill establishes strict standards for use of fertility clinic embryos. First, written permission is required of the couple donating the embryo. Second, there can be no financial compensation, much like organ donation. Finally, the legislation requires the National Institutes of Health to establish strict oversight for the scientific community to ensure ethical guidelines are adhered to.

Embryonic stem cell research is a new form of research in the early stages. I am fundamentally opposed to cloning embryos or creating embryos for scientific research. This

legislation does not allow cloning, it merely ensures that embryos already created and unused serve a higher purpose than being destroyed.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 810, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act and H.R. 2520, the Stem Cell Therapeutic and Research Act that we debated earlier today. Both bills would expand stem cell research, which holds tremendous promise to curing and treating some of the most devastating diseases and conditions facing Americans today. This issue is about medical research coupled with high ethical standards and providing hope to those most in need—it should have no role in any party's political agenda.

In 2001, President Bush announced that for the first time federal funds could be used to support limited research on human embryonic stem cells, specifically "existing stem cell lines where the life and death decision has already been made." Under this policy, only 78 embryonic stem cell lines are eligible for use and according to the National Institutes of Health (NIH), only 22 of those lines are viable for human research. Since 2001, 128 embryonic stem cell lines have been developed that are ineligible for federally funded research.

Both bills—the Stem Cell Therapeutic and Research Act that would create a new federal program to collect and store umbilical-cord-blood cells and expand the current bone-marrow registry program and the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act that would increase the number of stem cell lines that can be used in federally funded research—establish much-needed ethical standards and expand the possibilities of stem cell research for new treatments and cures.

According to the NIH, in the United States more than 4 million people suffer from Alzheimer's disease; one in every four deaths is from cancer; and every hour of every day, someone is diagnosed with juvenile (type 1) diabetes. These brave individuals battling life-threatening and debilitating diseases are not responsible for policy or debate, but they will be the ones most affected by the outcome of today's vote.

The President was quoted by the Associated Press over the weekend saying, "I made it very clear to the Congress that the use of federal money, taxpayers' money to promote science which destroys life in order to save life is—I'm against that. And therefore, if the bill does that, I will veto it." This legislation will not create life for the purpose of destruction. These bills will expand the scope of research that the Bush Administration has already approved. It is unfortunate President Bush would dash the hopes of so many people looking for medical answers through research.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues join me today in advancing science and supporting H.R. 810. Congress and the Administration must not withdraw from progress, but embrace the immense opportunities that expanded stem cell research can have for the future and wellbeing of our Nation's public health.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act, H.R. 810. I would like to thank Representatives CASTLE and DEGETTE for their leadership on this important issue.

Recent advancements in medical technology have created hope for the millions of

people, and their families, who suffer from the effects of diseases like Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, and diabetes. Stem cell research may hold the key to better treatment options, and even a cure, for diseases like these and others.

Many of us will have lasting images of President Ronald Reagan and Christopher Reeves as their frail bodies deteriorated over the years. And I will never forget my own father's battle against Alzheimer's and how his slow deterioration and passing impacted our family. Their personal health battles took on a new meaning as the public debate heated up over the merits and ethics of embryonic stem cell research.

As we look towards the future of medical research, we must always proceed with strict ethical caution. I believe the Castle/DeGette legislation meets this criteria by establishing strict requirements for which new embryonic stem cell lines would be eligible for federal funding. Federal funding of embryonic stem cell research would mean that research could advance at a faster pace while providing stringent requirements and oversight of the research. National and international involvement is needed to ensure research institutions and companies do not intentionally or unintentionally overreach their bounds.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor of H.R. 810, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act of 2005, I rise in strong support of this legislation. H.R. 810 is essential legislation that will expand opportunities for scientists to treat spinal cord injuries, multiple sclerosis, Parkinson's disease, Alzheimer's disease, diabetes, and other devastating diseases.

There are ethical concerns over the use of embryonic stem cells in research, and we should not treat stem cells as just another laboratory product. We must strongly prohibit unethical practices, such as human cloning. And we should not allow embryos to be bought and sold.

But it is important to recognize that, as part of the process of in vitro fertilization, many embryos are created that are never used and are slated to be destroyed. With the stringent moral safeguards established by this legislation, including the required written consent of the donors, I believe we should permit the use of stem cells from these embryos. The use of embryos for research that would otherwise be destroyed strikes a responsible balance between the ethical and medical values associated with stem cell research.

The current state of stem cell research suggests that there is significant progress to be made if we move forward in this area. Leading scientists have testified that adult stem cells and umbilical cord stem cells do not share the ability of embryonic stem cells to replicate all other cells in the human body. If we don't invest in stem cell research, millions of Americans with some of the most debilitating diseases will not be able to avail themselves of the treatments or cures that might result.

In addition, if we fail to invest federal resources in embryonic stem cell research, the U.S. will lose its competitive advantage in this essential area of science. The limited federal support for stem cell research is just one area of science in which the U.S. is falling behind. Last year China produced 160,000 more engineers than we did. Nearly 40 percent of U.S. jobs in science or technology requiring a Ph.D.

are now filled by people born abroad—that's up from 25 percent in 1990. We now rank below 13 other countries—including Japan, Germany, and South Korea—in the percentage of 24-year-olds with a college degree in a science or engineering field—that's down from third in the world 25 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will help the U.S. to move forward on our moral imperative to perform stem cell research in an ethically responsible way. I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, the promise of curing a whole host of debilitating diseases is brighter than it's ever been. Today, Congress has the opportunity to capitalize on breakthrough scientific research to help millions across our country.

Representatives CASTLE and DEGETTE have crafted this bill meticulously, which would allow the use of surplus embryos from in vitro fertilization treatments and require donor consent. It does not allow stem cells to be sold for profit. This legislation takes an ethical and moral approach to a challenging subject, and throughout is respectful of the value of life.

Real political courage and leadership—on both sides of the aisle, in the House and Senate—was required to bring us to this point. People from every point along the political spectrum—from Nancy Reagan to the late Christopher Reeve—have embraced the promise and potential of stem cell research.

Parkinson's, cancer, Alzheimer's, juvenile diabetes, spinal cord injuries—cures for these and other serious ailments may lie in stem cell research. We owe it to generations of suffering Americans and their families to help find treatments that could lead to full recovery.

Many in this body like to talk about "values." Today, I say to them: using discarded embryos to find scientific cures for fatal diseases is our moral obligation. Saving life is precisely what we all care about.

Mr. Speaker, a vote for H.R. 810 is a vote to save lives. I urge all my colleagues to support this bipartisan, bicameral legislation.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I have been watching today's proceedings from California as I recuperate from surgery. I feel compelled to reach out to my colleagues to underscore the utmost importance of H.R. 810, the "Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act."

H.R. 810 is a comprehensive bill that fully balances the ethical concerns associated with stem cell research with the incalculable benefits such research can confer upon millions of Americans.

Now is the time for action! We must continue to expand the scope of embryonic stem cell research. We must not tie the hands of researchers who will hopefully deliver to our communities cures for these life threatening diseases.

Research on adult stem cells is important. However, I think we need to recognize the limitations that are inherent in that type of research. While adult stem cells are being used to treat blood diseases such as leukemia and lymphoma, adult stem cells cannot be used to form any cell. Experts believe that adult stem cells are not going to produce the answers to diseases like sickle cell disease, Multiple Sclerosis, heart disease, liver disease, Parkinson's, Alzheimer's, and numerous kinds of cancers we so desperately seek. Adult stem cells are not a substitute for embryonic stem cells.

I would like to speak specifically to the large numbers of African Americans and other minorities who will hugely benefit from this potentially lifesaving research. Too many of my constituents are disproportionately affected by many of the diseases researchers hope to cure with information gleaned from embryonic stem cell research.

In particular, diabetes, Parkinson's, and especially sickle cell disease run rampant in our communities. I want to be able to look at every single one of my constituents who is afflicted with a disease that researchers believe they can treat eventually based on research done on embryonic stem cells and tell them that here in Washington we are doing absolutely everything we can to save their lives and assuage their pain.

I introduced bills over the last two Congresses to bring awareness to the need for expanding the number of stem cell lines because I recognize that we must embrace groundbreaking solutions to the problems posed by fatal diseases.

The research has progressed so far since 1998, when scientists first isolated human embryonic stem cells. Amazing discoveries have been made in such a short time. What sense would there be in restricting the ability of researchers to, within the boundaries set by, strict ethical guidelines, progress with this research as far as is possible? Why are we tying the hands of our scientific community to save lives on the basis of an arbitrary date, while across the world this research will be used to save lives?

This bill answers those questions resoundingly: we will not unduly restrict the essential research that could save the lives of millions. We will move forward. We will find an end to suffering that could be prevented, in my community and nationwide.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to say that I will be casting my vote for H.R. 810, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act of 2005.

I am voting for this legislation with the face of Ashley Dahly on my mind. Ashley is a 17-year-old high school junior from Devils Lake, North Dakota. She is a happy teenager with an adoring family. She likes school, enjoys Student Congress and speech class, and loves ice skating.

Ashley also has juvenile diabetes. In fact, today she is at home missing her finals because of high blood sugars. Ashley is North Dakota's delegate for Children's Congress through the Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation, taking place here in Washington on June 18–22nd. Ashley's goal is to enter a health-related field such as a nurse or diabetes educator, because as Ashley has said, "I know the pain that children diagnosed with diabetes go through, and I think I could help in relieving that pain."

There is currently no cure for juvenile diabetes, a disease that affects another child every hour of every day. Embryonic stem cell research offers great potential for advancing treatments or even curing diabetes, as well as many other diseases such as Parkinson's disease, cancer, ALS, paralysis and others. Particularly in the case of diabetes, embryonic stem cell research holds the greatest possibility for understanding and curing this disease, since adult stem cells are not present in the pancreas, the organ attacked by diabetes.

Embryonic stem cell research is an extremely difficult issue, involving the potential

for critical medical breakthroughs on the one hand, and very complex bio-ethical issues on the other. The bill requires that research only be conducted on stem cells derived from embryos created for fertility treatments that were in excess of the need of the mother and would otherwise have been destroyed. My vote today is supported by over 200 major patient groups, scientists, and medical research groups, and I believe that my vote can provide hope to families in North Dakota like Ashley's who are suffering through the illness of a loved one.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, on the birthday of my daughter, Katy, who was born 8–10 weeks prematurely, but still lives and blesses my life. There are so many well-meaning people who want to see others cured. We, everyone of us in this body, want that. We know that. It is being said that no one will be harmed by the use or destruction of human embryos that were going to be waste anyway. Dear friends, when you use the product of the callous mistreatment of life, even though you use sterilized gloves, you nonetheless are an accomplice after the fact in encouraging future such destruction and mistreatment—even though you have the very very best of intentions. How many times as a judge have I heard, "But, I never meant to hurt anyone. I thought I was just helping."

In the recent past, we lost a great American who had been injured in an accident and who encouraged the use of embryonic stem cells. That man had a heart as big as all outdoors and is an inspiration to so very many of us. His strength and courage and perseverance in the face of unsurmountable odds should be an encouragement for all who face adversity. He is quoted as saying something that others have said, but as a justification for embryonic stem cell usage—basically that we should be about doing the greatest good for the greatest number of people. That is the utilitarian way.

It is worth noting that if a society only did what was the greatest good for the greatest number of people, that society would kill off the elderly who were no longer productive and kill off the young who were not likely to ever be very productive. That would also be a society that did not spend time trying to fix something that had been extremely broken. That is a society that would simply weigh the cost to repair a human, decide that such person was "Totaled" then clone a new one to replace it. That society would be killing its very soul.

That is not the American way. We want to be a help to the helpless, and speak for those who can't speak. A moral society should do that. To demand money from American taxpayers so that we as a Congress can encourage the destructive use of life under the guise that it may be thrown away anyway, is not a direction that this America should go. Our history has been that, rather than destroying life, we go to all kinds of extremes to save it. If a child is in a deep hole, America sends all the resources it has to try to save it regardless of cost. When someone may not return from a trip to the moon, we use every available resource to try to bring them home. When a soldier is captured or out on the battlefield wounded, many others often risk their lives to save the one. That has been, that should be our legacy. What a legacy! But to demand money with the full force of the federal government's enforcement and the IRS so that the beginning of life can be destroyed, will add

such a darkness on the conscience of this society, we simply should go no farther down that road.

It is a bit offensive that some would come forward and assert that we are telling individuals with Lou Gehrig's disease and other terribly debilitating diseases that we will not look for a cure—that we basically do not care. We are looking for cures and we are doing so with the most promising avenues available and that is with stem cells that do not destroy life.

It is extremely offensive that some would come forward and say basically that in the name of religion, Christian and Jewish groups support the federal government's certain destruction of embryos under the possibility that at some point it somehow may lead to possibly saving a life or lives. If we are going to invoke the thought of, as our forefathers' put it, our Creator, then let's at least invoke our Creator's unwavering honesty. The truth is that this bill is not determining whether embryonic stem cell research will go on. If it is so incredibly and amazingly promising, do you know who would be all over this? Private pharmaceutical and health care industries would be in pursuit knowing that if they find a cure, they will be the most profitable company on the face of the earth.

But it is not private investment capital that is being sought. It is people wanting grants that will be torn from the pockets of taxpayers against the will of perhaps half of them or more (polling data from those with an agenda is not all that trustworthy) and putting it into someone else's pocket in the name of destroying embryos.

Embryonic stem cell research can go on and has gone on with billions of dollars from some states and from some private money. What many of us are saying about this legislation is, if it is so promising, you go raise the capital privately by buying stock to use in embryonic stem cell research, and let our tax dollars go to the stem cell research that seeks to both save and make lives better. I know this is a matter of conscience, and I do so know and believe in the integrity and great intentions of many of those who disagree, but please do not take my tax dollars for money to destroy life. Let those who feel so compelled, spend your own, but I would hope even then you would spend your own money on the lines with the most promise and not take life in the name of helping life.

May God not only bless, but have mercy on us all.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support H.R. 810, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act of 2005. This legislation takes the critical first step in expanding the number of stem cell lines that are eligible for federally funded research.

For years, the United States has been the preeminent world leader in the field of biotechnology. We have made extraordinary advancements in the treatment, management and prevention of a wide range of disabilities. It's nearly impossible to read a newspaper without hearing of some new breakthrough—drug cocktails for AIDS patients; gene therapy treatments; new medical devices.

These advancements are cause for celebration. Our mothers and fathers, our spouses, children and grandchildren are benefiting like never before. They are living longer, healthier lives due to our investments in scientific research.

Much like this earlier research, the potential benefits from stem cells are almost limitless. And as policymakers, we have the rare opportunity to help further scientific innovation that, with the proper research and development, could produce better treatments—or even cures—for diseases like diabetes, Parkinson's Disease, and cancer.

Despite some arguments that we have heard today, recent developments have proven that we are not far off from recognizing the true potential of this research. In fact, just last week, scientists in South Korea successfully created the world's first human embryonic stem cells that are patient-specific. This advancement was applauded around the world as a major step in the effort to produce cell-based therapies that won't be rejected by the body's immune system.

And in my home state of Massachusetts, ViaCell and New World Laboratories, two small biotech companies, have made notable progress in their research on spinal cord injuries and tissue regeneration. Though no one can predict the outcome of embryonic stem cell research, what is certain is that without federal support, we will never fully recognize it's potential.

We are at a pivotal point in our nation's history, and I hope that my colleagues will carefully consider this issue, leaving out partisan politics. With federal support, this research could have a real and tangible impact on millions of lives in this country. Our Nation's current policy severely limits scientific research, and we must not continue on this dangerous course. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 810.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 810, the "Stem Cell Research and Enhancement Act of 2005."

Let us be very clear about why we are here today. We are here to decide whether our Nation will move forward in the search for treatments and therapies that will cure a multitude of dreaded diseases that afflict an estimated 128 million Americans.

Today, millions of Americans suffer from Alzheimer's disease, Parkinson's disease, spinal cord injuries or spinal dysfunction, and diabetes. And today, along with the tremendous number of Americans living with cancer, approximately 1.5 million new cases were diagnosed in the United States last year. Today, we can vote for H.R. 810, and in doing so, choose to save lives and help to end the suffering of so many Americans.

Stem cells are the foundation cells for every organ, tissue, and cell in the body. Embryonic stem cells, unlike adult stem cells, possess a unique ability to develop into any type of cell. Embryonic stem cell research holds the potential for treating a variety of diseases such as Lou Gehrig's disease, Parkinson's disease, Alzheimer's disease, autism, cystic fibrosis, heart disease, diabetes, multiple sclerosis, and osteoporosis, as well as spinal cord injuries.

H.R. 810 would impose strict ethical guidelines for embryonic stem cell research and would lift the arbitrary restriction limiting funds to only some embryonic stem cell lines created before August 10, 2001. By removing this arbitrary restriction, H.R. 810 will ensure that researchers can not only continue their work to prolong or save lives, but also conduct such research using newer, less contaminated, more diverse, and more numerous embryonic stem cells.

H.R. 810 does not allow Federal funding for the creation or destruction of embryos. This bill only allows for research on embryonic stem cell lines retrieved from embryos created for reproductive purposes that would otherwise be discarded. This point is critical: If these embryos are not used for stem cell research, they will be destroyed.

Former first lady Nancy Reagan once said, "Science has presented us with a hope called stem cell research, which may provide our scientists with many answers that for so long have been beyond our grasp. I just don't see how we can turn our backs on this. We have lost so much time already. I just really can't bear to lose any more."

Let us not turn our backs on this important research and the 128 million Americans who could benefit from it. Let us not lose any more time. Let us pass H.R. 810, the "Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act of 2005."

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a cosponsor and strong supporter of H.R. 810, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act. I am pleased that the House leadership brought this important legislation to the floor and am proud to be a part of the important debate occurring today.

Mr. Speaker, embryonic stem cells have the ability to develop into virtually any cell in the body, and many believe they may have the potential to treat many illnesses such as Parkinson's disease, juvenile diabetes, Alzheimer's, blindness, sickle cell anemia and many other medical conditions, including spinal cord injuries. Like many other issues facing us today, however, stem cell research forces us to confront the challenge of balancing long-standing ethical questions with the possibilities presented by scientific and technological advancements. The remarks made on the floor today by my colleagues have reflected the difficulty in dealing with this issue, as many members wrestle with their beliefs and emotions.

Most familiar with this issue know that in August 2001, President Bush announced that federal funds for the first time would be used to support research on human embryonic stem cells. However, the funding would be limited to "existing stem cell lines." The National Institutes of Health (NIH) has established the Human Embryonic Stem Cell Registry, which lists stem cell lines that are eligible for use in federally funded research. Although 78 cell lines are listed, 22 embryonic stem cell lines are currently available. Scientists are concerned about the quality, longevity, and availability of the eligible stem cell lines.

That is why I am a cosponsor of H.R. 810, and strongly support its passage. This important legislation increases the number of lines of stem cells that would be eligible to be used in federally funded research. It does so, however, by requiring that the stem cells meet certain requirements. Specifically, the stem cells must be derived from human embryos donated from in vitro fertilization clinics. They also must have been created for the purpose of fertility treatment, but were in excess of the clinical need. The embryos must also not have been intended for use in fertility treatment, and would otherwise be discarded. Finally, under H.R. 810, the embryos must have been donated by individuals seeking fertility treatment with informed written consent and without any financial payment or other inducement to make the donation.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened as member after member has come to the floor to tell a personal tale of a loved one suffering from a disease that, with additional research, stem cells could help cure. We all have our stories Mr. Speaker. My uncle, Morris K. Udall, who served in this body for decades, suffered from Parkinson's disease. There are too many people across the world suffering from devastating diseases for which stem cells hold great hope and promise. We need to foster additional research that is conducted in an ethically responsible way. H.R. 810 does just that.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 810, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act of 2005.

H.R. 810 is the safest, most ethically and morally sound way to proceed with this potentially life-saving scientific advancement. This debate is not about whether or not embryonic stem cell research should occur. The Administration is not stopping private embryonic stem cell research. It just opposes the expansion of public stem cell research.

The private sector is not restricted from such research. The private sector currently uses frozen embryos which would otherwise be discarded. Corporate entities already have access to 125 new and better embryonic stem cell lines, created after August 9, 2001, when the President announced his new stem cell policy.

H.R. 810 expands the number of frozen embryos to be used for stem cell research by the Federal Government. Federally sponsored research is subject to greater oversight and safeguards and higher ethical standards. Ethical controls over privately funded research are limited.

Recent scientific breakthroughs have demonstrated that embryonic stem cell research has life saving potential. It could result in saving millions of lives. It could be the answer to the prayers of those who suffer from Parkinson's, diabetes, cancer, heart disease, spinal cord injuries and other debilitating conditions. Recent studies have set back the case for the efficacy of adult stem cells.

Embryonic stem cell research will continue with or without the federal government. This bill expands federal research, which will be subject to greater oversight and safeguards.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act, which will expand the federal policy and implement stricter ethical guidelines for this research.

Embryonic stem cell research is necessary in discovering the causes of a myriad of genetic diseases, to testing new drug therapies more efficiently on laboratory tissue instead of human volunteers, and to staving off the ravages of disease with the regeneration of our bodies' essential organs.

President George W. Bush's policy on stem cell research limits federal funding only to embryonic stem cell lines that were derived by August 9, 2001, the date of his policy announcement.

Of the 78 stem cell lines promised by President Bush, only 22 are available to researchers.

Unfortunately these stem cell lines are aged and contaminated with mouse feeder cells, making their therapeutic use for humans uncertain. According to the majority of scientists,

if these stem cell lines were transplanted into people, they would provoke dangerous viruses in humans.

What is even more disturbing is the fact that there are at least 125 new stem cell lines, which are more pristine than the lines currently available on the National Institutes of Health registry, which are ineligible for federally-funded research because they were derived after August 9, 2001.

This restrictive embryonic stem cell research policy is making it increasingly more difficult to attract new scientists to this area of research because of concerns that funding restrictions will keep this research from being successful.

The Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act does not change the current policy on the use of federal funds; this measure simply seeks to lift the cutoff date for lines available for research.

H.R. 810 will also strengthen the ethical standards guiding the federal research on stem cell lines and will ensure that embryos donated for stem cell research were created for the purposes of in vitro fertilization, in excess of clinical need, would have otherwise be discarded and involved no financial inducement.

Contrary to what opponents have been saying, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act will not federally fund the destruction of embryos.

H.R. 810 is clear that unused embryos will be used for embryonic stem cell research only by decision of the donor. No federally-funded research will be supported by this measure if the embryos were created and destroyed solely for this purpose.

In February 2005, the Civil Society Institute conducted a nationwide survey of 1,022 adults and found that 70 percent supported bipartisan federal legislation to promote embryonic stem cell research.

Let public interest triumph over ideological special interests. Public interest is best served when the medical and the scientific community is free to exercise their professional judgment in extending and enhancing human life.

I urge all my colleagues to vote in favor of the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 810, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act of 2005.

Stem cells have tremendous promise to treat a myriad of devastating diseases and disorders.

Embryonic stem cells can become any cell type in the body, and their promise lies in the ability to tailor-make cellular treatments, heart muscle for heart disease, pancreas cells for diabetes, or nervous system cells for spinal cord injury.

Stem cells are relatively new on the research scene; it was only in 1998 that the techniques were developed to isolate stem cells from humans, and we have a lot to learn about how to make the cells develop in the ways that will be essential for therapeutic application.

Today, I would like to highlight how the Reeve-Irvine Research Center has made significant head way in making the promise of embryonic stem cells a reality.

Work recently published by Dr. Hans Keirstead and his group has shown that they are able to turn human embryonic stem cells into a clinically useful cell type.

To use embryonic stem cells for therapy, it is critical to devise ways to cause them to turn into particular cell types. If un-differentiated stem cells are transplanted into the brain or spinal cord, they may become a teratoma, a tumor made of many different cells like bone, muscle, and hair.

So, to be useful for therapy, embryonic stem cells must be "restricted" to differentiate into the desired cell types. That is, they must be told what specific cell type to turn into as they mature.

Dr. Keirstead's group has developed a unique method to create these differentiated cells.

Moreover, as report in Journal of Neuroscience, his group has been successful in transplanting these cells into an acute spinal cord injury.

Once transplanted, these cells have been able to survive in a living organism, move to areas where they are needed, and do what they are supposed to do.

The result is a significant improvement in walking ability, at least at an early time point post injury. This finding is proof of principle that human embryonic stem cells can be a viable therapeutic agent.

Dr. Keirstead's cells are on the federally approved list. They are among the very few lines that are actually usable, and he is among the very few who have had access to human embryonic stem cells.

Dr. Keirstead's progress since 2001 when he received the cells has been remarkable. His group has learned how to maintain the embryonic stem cells, no small feat in itself. They have learned how to transform the cells into differentiated cells, they have learned how to use the cells to treat new spinal cord injury in animals.

All this in less than 4 years, and in one lab. Imagine the progress that could have been made with, 100 labs working with embryonic stem cells on not only spinal cord injury but Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, diabetes, and so many others.

The Reeve-Irvine Research Center is one of a handful of places in the U.S. that has the know-how to use embryonic stem cells.

With more lines available, we could readily address issues related to paralysis by developing new cell populations, like motor neurons, or by testing the therapeutic quality of other lines.

In addition, more researchers would be able to devote their talents to this area of research.

My father is suffering from Alzheimer's. I know that my family would do anything to find a cure for this horribly degenerative disease. I would ask my colleagues, would your family do any differently? Would the families of your constituents do any differently?

The Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act of 2005 before Congress today, if passed, would open the door to our country's brightest scientists to find the treatments that Dr. Keirstead's work suggests are really there waiting to be discovered.

I urge my colleagues to support this research and to vote for H.R. 810.

Ms. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my strong, principled and hopeful support of H.R. 810. I commend the vital leadership of my brave colleagues, Representatives CASTLE and DEGETTE, for bringing this urgent issue to the floor.

Federal funding for embryonic stem cell research is needed to help American scientists

move this research forward, research which has the potential to revolutionize medicine and save countless lives.

While adult stem cells have been very useful in treating some cancers, embryonic stem cells appear to have a far greater potential for treating disease than adult stem cells. Scientists regard embryonic stem cell research as one of the greatest hopes for the cure of medical conditions such as Parkinson's disease and diabetes due to their unique ability to develop into virtually any type of cell in the body.

Recently, researchers at the University of Miami came up with a technique to transform embryonic stem cells into the insulin-producing cells destroyed by Type-1 diabetes. Such research may also help us better understand the causes of birth defects, genetic abnormalities, and other conditions that arise during the critical period of early human growth. Other possible medical applications include the repair of crippling injuries such as spinal cord damage and the ability to correct the damaging side effects of existing medical treatments like chemotherapy.

This debate is not about whether or not embryonic stem cell research will progress, for it surely will. This research is already taking place around the globe, and right here in America. The question is: will we lead the way? This debate is about American leadership in this world. For generations America has led the world in scientific advances. We must continue to support the work of our brilliant scientists and help them once again lead the world in this vitally important new field.

This bipartisan legislation would expand the scope of stem cell research while enacting stringent procedural guidelines. All activities would be subject to the strict ethical guidelines of the National Institutes of Health. No federal funds would be used to conduct research on unapproved stem cell lines. The cells used in this research will be donated voluntarily by patients of in-vitro fertilization clinics. It makes no sense, and it is just plain wrong to ban research using embryos that are being simply thrown away today.

Mr. Speaker, it is not our place as legislators to decide which medical research does and does not have merit. We must not block advances in life-saving and ethically conducted science. I commend my colleagues for supporting this critical legislation.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act of 2005, I believe that stem cell research holds the promise of scientific breakthroughs that could improve the lives of millions of Americans. This bi-partisan legislation would provide federal funding for a wider range of research while establishing ethical guidelines.

The most compelling arguments for expanding federal funding for stem cell research can be heard in the heart wrenching stories of individuals suffering from debilitating diseases for which there are currently no cures or treatments. While it is too late for the countless Americans who have passed away from terrible diseases, it is not too late for the millions of other Americans hoping this House will support funding for this potentially life-saving resource. For these patients and their families stem cell research is the last hope for a cure.

This bill provides that embryos that are otherwise likely to be discarded can be used to help develop treatments for debilitating dis-

eases and life saving cures. We should allow federally supported research to proceed to find such treatments and cures.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 810, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act of 2005. This bill would expand the current Federal policy on embryonic stem cell research by allowing federally funded research on stem cell lines derived after August 9, 2001, while implementing strong ethical guidelines to ensure Federal oversight of the research.

Most of the scientific community believes that for the full potential of embryonic stem cell research to be reached, the number of cell lines readily available to scientists must increase. Just last month, a number of NIH directors testified before the Senate Appropriations Committee that the current policy is restrictive and hinders scientific progress. We are already at risk of losing our scientific and technological edge because of increasing competition around the world.

Other countries—such as China, India, and the United Kingdom—are forging ahead with embryonic stem cell research because of less restrictive policies. India, for example, has an extensive stem cell regulatory system, yet allows the derivation of new stem cells from surplus embryos at fertility clinics. Our restrictive policy not only puts us at risk of losing our scientific edge, we are also at risk of losing some of the best American scientists to other countries where policies are less restrictive.

Important advances in the science of embryonic stem cell research have been made since the August 2001 policy was set. Earlier this year, researchers at the University of Wisconsin in Madison figured out how to grow human embryonic stem cells without using mouse feeder cells. This is exciting news since mouse feeder cells are thought to be a source of contamination if the cells are ever to be used therapeutically in humans.

From its earliest days, stem cell research has been important to the people of Wisconsin. In fact, Dr. James Thomson, a researcher at the University of Wisconsin, was the first to isolate and culture embryonic stem cells.

In 2003, this esteemed researcher received the Frank Annunzio award, given to recognize the innovative research of American scientists who devote their careers to improving the lives of people through their work in science. Wisconsin has been at the forefront of embryonic stem cell research from the beginning. This legislation is essential to make sure the important work of our scientists is not unnecessarily sidetracked by politics.

But this legislation is not only important because of the potential for advances in science and technology. More important is the fact that embryonic stem cell research could lead to new treatments and cures for the many Americans afflicted with life-threatening and debilitating diseases. Scientists believe these cells could be used to treat many diseases, including Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, diabetes, and spinal cord injuries. However, the promise of this research may not be reached if the Federal policy is not expanded.

Mr. Speaker, it has become increasingly clear that the American public supports expanding the Federal stem cell policy. Just yesterday, results from a survey of Wisconsin voters were released showing overwhelming support for embryonic stem cell research. Nearly

two-thirds of those polled support expanding Federal policies to support more research—regardless of party affiliation.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation that will allow science to move forward unimpeded, has the potential to revolutionize the practice of medicine, and can offer hope to the millions of Americans suffering from debilitating diseases.

Mr. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this bill and all of the promise that comes with funding embryonic stem cell research. This bill represents an important step forward for the scientific and medical communities in our country, offering hope to the millions of Americans who suffer from diseases that stem cell therapies may be able to cure.

Unfortunately, President Bush has threatened to veto this bill when it arrives on his desk. I am appalled that a President who talks so much about embracing a "culture of life" would deny funding for a possible cure that could save a child from suffering from juvenile diabetes; repair a damaged spinal cord to allow a person to walk again; save a grandparent from the onset of Alzheimer's disease; or put a halt to the ravages of Parkinson's disease.

The potential benefits from embryonic stem cell research are almost boundless and would certainly touch the life of a friend or family member of everyone in America. Mr. Bush's ban on providing Federal funds for stem cell research has seriously damaged our Nation's efforts to be a leading voice in the development of this new technology.

Allowing Federal funding for research on stem cells is vital to making real progress as quickly as possible to find real cures. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill that will certainly have long-lasting effects in improving the health and well being of millions of Americans.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as a physician I'm certain of one thing: Science is not Republican or Democrat, Science is not conservative or liberal. Science is science. Decisions in science should be based on the scientific method—a standardized method of evaluation and implementation of a solution or treatment of a disease.

When followed, it allows for the greatest amount of critical thinking about any issue. If followed, it results in the best outcome. This would be true in public policy as well. If not followed in a legislative body, then decisions tend to be made based upon who has the largest group of supporters or greatest passion and emotion. Now there is nothing wrong with numbers, passion or emotion, it just may not get you to the correct solution—especially in the scientific arena.

There has been significant misrepresentation of science today and in this debate, because "science is not a policy or a political program. Science is a systematic method for developing and testing hypotheses about the physical world. It does not promise miracle cures based on scanty evidence. . . . statements . . . made regarding the purported medical applications of embryonic stem cells reach far beyond any credible evidence, ignoring the limited state of our knowledge about embryonic stem cells and the advances in other areas of research that may render use of these cells unnecessary for many applications. To make such exaggerated claims, at

this stage of our knowledge, is not only scientifically irresponsible—it is deceptive and cruel to millions of patients and their families who hope desperately for cures and have come to rely on the scientific community for accurate information. . . . Non-embryonic stem cells” on the other hand have a history “very different from that of embryonic stem cells.” Cord and adult stem cells are “Producing undoubted clinical benefits and . . . (b) one marrow transplants” have benefited “patients with various forms of cancer for many years before it was understood that the active ingredients in these transplants are stem cells. . . . Use of these cells poses no serious ethical problem, and may avoid all problems of tissue rejection if stem cells can be obtained from a patient for use in that same patient. . . . In contrast to embryonic stem cells, adult stem cells are in established or experimental use to treat human patients with several dozen conditions. . . . They have been or are being assessed in human trials for treatment of spinal cord injury, Parkinson’s disease, stroke, cardiac damage, multiple sclerosis,” juvenile diabetes “and so on. . . .

“Therefore . . . to declare that” embryonic stem cell research “will . . . receive any particular amount of federal funding, regardless of future evidence or the usual scientific peer review process—is . . . irresponsible. It is, in fact, a subordination of science to ideology.

“Because politicians, biotechnology interests and even some scientists have publicly exaggerated the “promise” of embryonic stem cells, public perceptions of this avenue have become skewed and unrealistic. Politicians may hope to benefit from these false hopes to win elections. . . . The scientific and medical professions have no such luxury. When desperate patients discover that they have been subjected to a salesman’s pitch rather than an objective and candid assessment of possibilities, we have reason to fear public backlash against the credibility of our profession. We urge you not to exacerbate this problem now by repeating false promises that exploit patients’ hopes for political gain.”

I have quoted from a letter signed by 57 scientists—MD’s and PhD’s—written during last year’s presidential campaign. It expressed real concern about a cavalier public posture and policy during a debate on such a sensitive ethical matter.

It seems to me that there is one unmistakable fact: Many in our society have sincere, heartfelt, passionate, ethical questions, worthy of our respect, regarding the scientific or medical use of ES cells.

If our goal is truly to cure diseases and help patients, science tells us that today the use of adult and cord stem cells has successfully treated or holds real potential for treating nearly 60 diseases. The same cannot be said for ES cells.

And adult stem cells carry none of the ethical questions or dilemma of ES cells.

I support stem cell research—active, aggressive, scientifically based—with respect for the difficult ethical questions we face today.

I urge my colleagues to join me in respecting current science—in respecting ethical concerns. If we do, we will recognize that stem cell research and treatment of disease should actively proceed with those adult and cord stem cells that are providing and will increasingly provide excellent and exciting cures for patients in need.

OCTOBER 27, 2004.

Senator JOHN F. KERRY,

John Kerry for President, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR KERRY: Recently you have made the promotion of embryonic stem cell research, including the cloning of human embryos for research purposes, into a centerpiece of your campaign. You have said you will make such research a “top priority” for government, academia and medicine (Los Angeles Times, 10/17/04). You have even equated support for this research with respect for “science,” and said that science must be freed from “ideology” to produce miracle cures for numerous diseases.

As professionals trained in the life sciences we are alarmed at these statements.

First, your statements misrepresent science. In itself, science is not a policy or a political program. Science is a systematic method for developing and testing hypotheses about the physical world. It does not “promise” miracle cures based on scanty evidence. When scientists make such assertions, they are acting as individuals, out of their own personal faith and hopes, not as the voice of “science”. If such scientists allow their individual faith in the future of embryonic stem cell research to be interpreted as a reliable prediction of the outcome of this research, they are acting irresponsibly.

Second, it is no mere “ideology” to be concerned about the possible misuse of humans in scientific research. Federal bioethics advisory groups, serving under both Democratic and Republican presidents, have affirmed that the human embryo is a developing form of human life that deserves respect. Indeed you have said that human life begins at conception, that fertilization produces a “human being.” To equate concern for these beings with mere “ideology” is to dismiss the entire history of efforts to protect human subjects from research abuse.

Third, the statements you have made regarding the purported medical applications of embryonic stem cells reach far beyond any credible evidence, ignoring the limited state of our knowledge about embryonic stem cells and the advances in other areas of research that may render use of these cells unnecessary for many applications. To make such exaggerated claims, at this stage of our knowledge, is not only scientifically irresponsible—it is deceptive and cruel to millions of patients and their families who hope desperately for cures and have come to rely on the scientific community for accurate information.

What does science tell us about embryonic stem cells? The facts can be summed up as follows:

At present these cells can be obtained only by destroying live human embryos at the blastocyst (4-7 days old) stage. They proliferate rapidly and are extremely versatile, ultimately capable (in an embryonic environment) of forming any kind of cell found in the developed human body. Yet there is scant scientific evidence that embryonic stem cells will form normal tissues in a culture dish, and the very versatility of these cells is now known to be a disadvantage as well—embryonic stem cells are difficult to develop into a stable cell line, spontaneously accumulate genetic abnormalities in culture, and are prone to uncontrollable growth and tumor formation when placed in animals.

Almost 25 years of research using mouse embryonic stem cells have produced limited indications of clinical benefit in some animals, as well as indications of serious and potentially lethal side-effects. Based on this evidence, claims of a safe and reliable treatment for any disease in humans are premature at best.

Embryonic stem cells obtained by destroying cloned human embryos pose an addi-

tional ethical issue—that of creating human lives solely to destroy them for research—and may pose added practical problems as well. The cloning process is now known to produce many problems of chaotic gene expression, and this may affect the usefulness and safety of these cells. Nor is it proven that cloning will prevent all rejection of embryonic stem cells, as even genetically matched stem cells from cloning are sometimes rejected by animal hosts. Some animal trials in research cloning have required placing cloned embryos in a womb and developing them to the fetal stage, then destroying them for their more developed tissues, to provide clinical benefit—surely an approach that poses horrific ethical issues if applied to humans.

Non-embryonic stem cells have also received increasing scientific attention. Here the trajectory has been very different from that of embryonic stem cells: Instead of developing these cells and deducing that they may someday have a clinical use, researchers have discovered them producing undoubted clinical benefits and then sought to better understand how and why they work so they can be put to more uses. Bone marrow transplants were benefiting patients with various forms of cancer for many years before it was understood that the active ingredients in these transplants are stem cells. Non-embryonic stem cells have been discovered in many unexpected tissues—in blood, nerve, fat, skin, muscle, umbilical cord blood, placenta, even dental pulp—and dozens of studies indicate that they are far more versatile than once thought. Use of these cells poses no serious ethical problem, and may avoid all problems of tissue rejection if stem cells can be obtained from a patient for use in that same patient. Clinical use of non-embryonic stem cells has grown greatly in recent years. In contrast to embryonic stem cells, adult stem cells are in established or experimental use to treat human patients with several dozen conditions, according to the National Institutes of Health and the National Marrow Donor Program (Cong. Record, September 9, 2004, pages H6956-7). They have been or are being assessed in human trials for treatment of spinal cord injury, Parkinson’s disease, stroke, cardiac damage, multiple sclerosis, and so on. The results of these experimental trials will help us better assess the medical prospects for stem cell therapies.

In the case of many conditions, advances are likely to come from sources other than any kind of stem cell. For example, there is a strong scientific consensus that complex diseases such as Alzheimer’s are unlikely to be treated by any stem cell therapy. When asked recently why so many people nonetheless believe that embryonic stem cells will provide a cure for Alzheimer’s disease, NIH stem cell expert Ron McKay commented that “people need a fairy tale” (Washington Post, June 10, 2004, page A3). Similarly, autoimmune diseases like juvenile diabetes, lupus and MS are unlikely to benefit from simple addition of new cells unless the underlying problem—a faulty immune system that attacks the body’s own cells as though they were foreign invaders—is corrected.

In short, embryonic stem cells pose one especially controversial avenue toward understanding and (perhaps) someday treating various degenerative diseases. Based on the available evidence, no one can predict with certainty whether they will ever produce clinical benefits—much less whether they will produce benefits unobtainable by other, less ethically problematic means.

Therefore, to turn this one approach into a political campaign—even more, to declare that it will be a “top priority” or receive

any particular amount of federal funding, regardless of future evidence or the usual scientific peer review process—is, in our view, irresponsible. It is, in fact, a subordination of science to ideology.

Because politicians, biotechnology interests and even some scientists have publicly exaggerated the “promise” of embryonic stem cells, public perceptions of this avenue have become skewed and unrealistic. Politicians may hope to benefit from these false hopes to win elections, knowing that the collision of these hopes with reality will come only after they win their races. The scientific and medical professions have no such luxury. When desperate patients discover that they have been subjected to a salesman’s pitch rather than an objective and candid assessment of possibilities, we have reason to fear a public backlash against the credibility of our professions. We urge you not to exacerbate this problem now by repeating false promises that exploit patients’ hopes for political gain.

Signed,

Rodney D. Adam, M.D., Professor of Medicine and Microbiology/Immunology, University of Arizona College of Medicine.

Michael J. Behe, Ph.D., Professor of Biological Sciences, Lehigh University.

Thomas G. Benoit, Ph.D., Professor and Chairman of Biology, McMurry University, Abilene, TX.

David L. Bolender, Ph.D., Department of Cell Biology, Neurobiology and Anatomy, Medical College of Wisconsin.

Daniel L. Burden, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Chemistry, Wheaton College.

William J. Burke, M.D., Ph.D., Professor in Neurology, Associate Professor in Medicine, Associate Professor in Neurobiology, Saint Louis University Medical Center.

Mark W. Burket, M.D., Professor of Medicine, Division of Cardiology, Medical College of Ohio.

W. Malcolm Byrnes, Ph.D., Assistant Professor, Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, Howard University College of Medicine.

Steven Calvin, M.D., Assistant Professor of OB/GYN and Women’s Health, Co-Chair, Program in Human Rights in Medicine, University of Minnesota School of Medicine.

James Carroll, M.D., Professor of Neurology, Pediatrics, and Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, Medical College of Georgia.

John R. Chaffee, M.D., Assistant Clinical Professor, Department of Family Medicine, University of Washington.

Robert Chasuk, M.D., Clinical Assistant Professor, Department of Family Medicine, Tulane University.

William P. Cheshire, Jr., M.D., Associate Professor of Neurology, Mayo Clinic.

Richard A. Chole, M.D., Ph.D., Professor and Head of Otolaryngology, Washington University in St. Louis, School of Medicine.

Maureen L. Condic, Ph.D., Associate Professor, Department of Neurobiology and Anatomy, University of Utah School of Medicine.

Keith A. Crist, Ph.D., Associate Professor, Department of Surgery, Medical College of Ohio.

Keith A. Crutcher, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Neurosurgery, University of Cincinnati Medical Center.

Frank Dennehy, M.D., FAAFP, Assistant Clinical Professor of Family Medicine, Virginia Commonwealth University.

Kenneth J. Dormer, M.S., Ph.D., Professor of Physiology, University of Oklahoma College of Medicine.

Lawrence W. Elmer, M.D., Ph.D., Associate Professor, Dept. of Neurology Director, Parkinson’s Disease and Movement Disorder Program, Medical Director, Center for Neurological Disorders, Medical College of Ohio.

Kevin T. FitzGerald, SJ, Ph.D., David P. Lauler Chair in Catholic Health Care Ethics, Research Associate Professor, Department of Oncology, Georgetown University Medical Center.

Raymond F. Gasser, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Cell Biology and Anatomy, Louisiana State University School of Medicine.

Hans Geisler, M.D., Clinical Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Indiana University Medical Center.

Donald A. Godfrey, Ph.D., Professor of Otolaryngology, Department of Surgery, Medical College of Ohio.

Samuel Hensley, M.D., Assistant Clinical Professor, School of Medicine, University of Mississippi.

David C. Hess, M.D., Professor and Chairman, Department of Neurology, Medical College of Georgia.

Paul J. Hoehner, M.D., MA, Ph.D., FAHA Associate Professor, Department of Anesthesiology, The University of Virginia School of Medicine.

C. Christopher Hook, M.D., Consultant in Hematology and Internal Medicine, Assistant Professor of Medicine, Mayo Clinic College of Medicine.

Elizabeth A. Johnson, M.D., Consultant, Hematology/Oncology, Mayo Clinic Jacksonville Assistant Professor of Oncology, Mayo Clinic College of Medicine.

Nancy L. Jones, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Pathology, Wake Forest University School of Medicine.

C. Ward Kischer, Ph.D., Emeritus Professor, Cell Biology and Anatomy, Specialty in Human Embryology, University of Arizona College of Medicine.

Kirsten J. Lampi, M.S., Ph.D., Associate Professor of Integrative Biosciences, School of Dentistry, Oregon Health Sciences University.

John I. Lane, M.D., Assistant Professor of Radiology, Mayo Clinic School of Medicine.

David L. Larson, M.D., Professor and Chairman, Department of Plastic Surgery, Medical College of Wisconsin.

Micheline Mathews-Roth, M.D., Associate Professor of Medicine, Harvard Medical School.

Roger R. Markwald, Ph.D., Professor and Chair, Department of Cell Biology and Anatomy, Medical University of South Carolina.

Victor E. Marquez, Ph.D., Chief, Laboratory of Medicinal Chemistry, Center for Cancer Research, National Cancer Institute, Frederick, Maryland.

Ralph P. Miech, M.D., Ph.D., Associate Professor Emeritus, Department of Molecular Pharmacology, Physiology & Biotechnology, Brown University School of Medicine.

Mary Ann Myers, M.D., Associate Professor, Medical College of Ohio.

Rimas J. Orentas, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Pediatrics, Hematology-Oncology Section, Medical College of Wisconsin.

Robert D. Orr, M.D., CM, Clinical Ethicist and Professor, University of Vermont College of Medicine.

Jean D. Peduzzi-Nelson, Ph.D., Research Associate Professor, Department of Visual Sciences, University of Alabama at Birmingham.

Edmund D. Pellegrino, M.D., Emeritus Professor, Medicine and Medical Ethics, Center for Clinical Bioethics, Georgetown University Medical Center.

John A. Petros, M.D., Associate Professor, Urology and Pathology, Emory University.

David A. Prentice, Ph.D., Affiliated Scholar, Center for Clinical Bioethics, Georgetown University Medical Center.

Paul J. Ranalli, M.D., FRCP, Lecturer, Division of Neurology, Department of Medicine, University of Toronto.

John F. Rebhun, Ph.D., Adjunct Scientist, Indiana University School of Medicine.

Leonard P. Rybak, M.D., Ph.D., Professor of Surgery, Southern Illinois University School of Medicine.

Dwayne D. Simmons, Ph.D., Director, Inner Ear Research Core Center, Department of Otolaryngology, Washington University School of Medicine.

Joseph B. Stanford, M.D., MSPH, Associate Professor, Family and Preventive Medicine, University of Utah.

John M. Templeton, Jr., M.D., FACS, Adjunct Professor of Pediatric Surgery, University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine.

Claire Thuning-Roberson, Ph.D., Vice President, Product Development and Compliance, Sunol Molecular Corporation, Miramar, Florida.

Anton-Lewis Usala, M.D., Chief Executive Officer and Medical Director, Clinical Trial Management Group, Greenville, North Carolina.

Richard A. Watson, M.D., Professor of Urologic Surgery, The University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey Medical School.

Dennis D. Weisenburger, M.D., Director of Hematopathology, Dept of Pathology and Microbiology, University of Nebraska School of Medicine.

H. Joseph Yost, PhD., Professor of Oncological Sciences, University of Utah.

Joseph R. Zanga, M.D., FAAP, FCP, President, American College of Pediatricians, Professor of Pediatrics, Brody School of Medicine, East Carolina University.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the bipartisan Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act, H.R. 810, legislation that will dramatically expand the number of stem cell lines available for federally funded research. This bill will allow scientists to more effectively pursue cures and therapies for a wide array of life-threatening illnesses and disabilities affecting millions of Americans.

Earlier today, the House passed a related but very different bill: the Stem Cell Therapeutic and Research Act, H.R. 2520. This legislation will create a new Federal program to collect and store umbilical-cord-blood stem cells for research purposes. I support the additional research on adult stem cells provided for by H.R. 2250, but this legislation is not a substitute for H.R. 810 and its emphasis on embryonic stem cell research.

Embryonic stem cells have a unique ability to develop into any type of cell as they mature, offering scientists tremendous insights on the replacement of damaged cells and organs, the mechanics of life-threatening diseases, and the testing and development of new drugs. Adult stem cells, on the other hand, have not shown this ability to differentiate into specific types of cells, have not yet been identified in all vital organs, and are difficult to identify, purify, and grow.

Although embryonic stem cell research promises extraordinary medical discoveries, the available supply of existing embryonic stem cells is woefully insufficient. According to the National Institutes of Health, NIH, only 22 of the 78 stem cell lines that were deemed eligible for Federal funding by President George Bush in 2001 are currently available to NIH investigators. Some of these 22 lines are too expensive or difficult to obtain, and some have been contaminated with non-human molecules diminishing their therapeutic value for humans. To make matters worse, these stem cell lines lack the genetic variation needed to develop therapies that will benefit the diverse population of the United States.

H.R. 810 addresses the shortage of embryonic stem cell lines by lifting the arbitrary and

indefensible August 9, 2001 cut-off date for stem cell eligibility. Since 2001, 128 embryonic stem cell lines have been developed, including disease-specific stem cell lines that allow researchers to understand the basic cause of some rare diseases. This legislation also provides stricter ethical guidelines to ensure that only the best and most ethical stem cell research will be federally funded.

The State of California has already taken steps to ensure that human embryonic stem cell research will be allowed to develop by establishing the Institute for Regenerative Medicine, which will devote \$3 billion to California universities and research institutions over the next 10 years. The passage of H.R. 810 will further empower and equip California scientific institutions to undertake cutting-edge research on the most pressing medical challenges of our day.

Let us make no mistake, the development of lifesaving medical procedures has been slowed by an unwarranted restriction on stem cell research. I believe that, as policymakers, we have a moral imperative to pursue innovative medical research that can improve the quality of life and prevent harmful illnesses and diseases for generations to come. I urge my colleagues to join the innumerable scientists, university leaders, patient groups, and medical research groups that support H.R. 810.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 810, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act of 2005. Stem-cell research holds tremendous promise for advances in health care for all Americans. Stem-cell research may one day lead to treatments for Parkinson's, Alzheimer's, arthritis, cancer, diabetes, multiple sclerosis, spinal-cord injuries, Lou Gehrig's disease, strokes, severe burns and many more diseases and injuries.

However, Mr. Speaker, nearly 4 years ago, the President made an arbitrary and shortsighted decision to limit federally funded embryonic stem-cell research to stem-cell lines that already existed. At that time, on August 9, 2001, the President promised 78 stem-cell lines would be available to Federal researchers, yet almost 4 years later, there are at most, only 22 lines available. Even worse, many of these lines are contaminated with animal cells that make them unusable for human therapeutic study. Mr. Speaker, the time has arrived for Congress to unshackle our researchers and scientists and allow them to expand the number of stem cell lines that are eligible for federally funded research.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, our own top scientists and officials at the National Institutes of Health, NIH, have stated that the President's 2001 limitations have caused us to fall behind in this research field. The NIH should be leading this cutting-edge research, yet it is in jeopardy of failing in this role should the President's policy be allowed to continue.

Some States, such as California, are attempting to fill the void left by the lack of Federal funding. However, Mr. Speaker, as the Director of the NIH has warned, this could lead to a patchwork of stem-cell policies, with different laws and regulations which could defeat the type of collaborative research NIH is chartered to carry out.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 810 would simply allow Federal funding for research on embryonic stem-cell lines regardless of the date on which they were derived. This means researchers

and scientists would be eligible to utilize their Federal funds for research on a new stem-cell line as long as it met the strict ethical guidelines contained in the bill. Those rules restrict stem cell lines to embryos that have been created originally for fertility purposes, and that are no longer needed for fertility. Second, the bill requires that the embryo have no further other use and be intended for destruction. Also, there must be written consent for donation of the embryo from the individuals for whom the embryo was created. Finally, the bill calls for the Director of NIH to issue guidelines to ensure that federally funded researchers adhere to ethical standards.

Mr. Speaker, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act of 2005 is needed to ensure that the full promise of embryonic stem-cell research is fulfilled. H.R. 810 allows research to take place in a safe, structured, and ethical manner. While all stem-cell research is important, the unique ability of embryonic stem cells to give rise to any tissue or cell in the body that makes these stem cells critically important to medical research. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and lift the President's restrictions that now obstruct effective federally funded embryonic stem-cell research.

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, as a proud cosponsor of H.R. 810, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act of 2005, I rise in support of this legislation. Those of us who have long supported the increased accessibility and possibilities of ethical stem cell research appreciate the opportunity the leadership has granted us by allowing a vote on this legislation today. I would also like to thank Representatives CASTLE and DEGETTE for their continued persistence to bring this bill to the floor.

We have all known someone who has suffered from Lou Gehrig's disease, Alzheimer's disease, Parkinson's disease, Multiple Sclerosis, Rett Syndrome, lupus, pulmonary fibrosis, juvenile diabetes, autism, cystic fibrosis, osteoporosis, spinal cord injuries, heart disease or cancer. By passing H.R. 810, we have the opportunity to help all of those individuals who are living with these and many other illnesses and injuries. Embryonic stem cell research holds the key to decreasing the pain and suffering of so many of our friends and family members. Furthermore, we have a moral obligation to do everything we can to help the millions of Americans, whose lives we hold in our hands, by allowing Federal funding to be used for this promising research.

The authors of H.R. 810 have gone to great lengths to guarantee that safeguards are in place to ensure the ethical use of embryonic stem cells. Embryos used for stem cell research under H.R. 810, will come from donor participation in in vitro fertilization, IVF, so embryos will not be created or cloned for research. This legislation also directs the experts at the National Institutes of Health to define the boundaries of this research. NIH has stated that they are prepared to institute these parameters. Such restrictions will ensure that rogue scientists are not performing dangerous and unethical experiments.

The United States has long been the leader of groundbreaking health research. Today we have the opportunity to ensure that the rest of the world does not continue to take the lead in health care advances. I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 810, not only

because U.S. based researchers deserve to be at the forefront of the development of promising new treatments, but also for all of our constituents, friends, and family members who are counting on us to support the effort to find cures for so many different diseases and illnesses.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand on the House floor today to speak in favor of the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act, legislation which will bring hope to millions of people suffering from disease in this nation. I want to thank Congresswoman DEGETTE and Congressman CASTLE for their tireless work in bringing this bill to the House floor for a vote.

The discovery of embryonic stem cells is a major scientific breakthrough. Embryonic stem cells have the potential to form any cell type in the human body. This could have profound implications for diseases such as Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, various forms of brain and spinal cord disorders, diabetes, and many types of cancer. According to the Coalition for the Advancement of Medical Research, there are at least 58 diseases which could potentially be cured through stem cell research.

That is why more than 200 major patient groups, scientists, and medical research groups and 80 Nobel Laureates support the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act. They know that this legislation will give us a chance to find cures to diseases affecting 100 million Americans.

I want to make clear that I oppose reproductive cloning, as we all do. I have voted against it in the past. However, that is vastly different from stem cell research and as an ovarian cancer survivor, I am not going to stand in the way of science.

Permitting peer-reviewed Federal funds to be used for this research, combined with public oversight of these activities, is our best assurance that research will be of the highest quality and performed with the greatest dignity and moral responsibility. The policy President Bush announced in August 2001 has limited access to stem cell lines and has stalled scientific progress.

As a cancer survivor, I know the desperation these families feel as they wait for a cure. This Congress must not stand in the way of that progress. We have an opportunity to change the lives of millions, and I hope we take it. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this important bill.

I have met with constituents with afflictions such as Alzheimer's disease, Parkinson's disease, childhood leukemia, heart disease, Lou Gehrig's disease, diabetes, several cancers, spinal cord injuries, and other diseases, disorders and injuries. Embryonic stem cell research offers them hope.

I have also met with an amazing young woman named Brooke Ellison from Long Island. In 1990, when she was eleven years old, Brooke was hit by a car, which left her paralyzed from the neck down. Even with this hardship, she graduated from Harvard University in 2000, Harvard's Kennedy School of Government in 2004, and she is currently a Ph.D. candidate in political science at Stony Brook University. Her inspiring story was made into a movie on A&E and was directed by the late Christopher Reeves.

I have worked with her to raise public awareness of the importance of stem cell research, and under the Unanimous Consent agreement, I am including an essay that Brooke wrote on the issue in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

As everyone here knows, on August 9, 2001, President Bush announced that embryonic stem cell research would be limited; he limited federal funds by limiting eligible lines for research.

Although scientists were expecting a big number of available lines, less than one third of the allowed 78 lines are available for distribution.

The Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act would expand research on embryonic stem cells by increasing the number of lines stem cells that would be eligible for federally funded research.

This bill should not be controversial. The bill ensures that strict ethical guidelines would be met: the embryos would have been donated with informed written consent and without any financial payment or other inducement to make the donation. These are embryos that will be discarded. Finally, the bill would not use any federal funds to derive the stem cells.

It is a good bill, but I wish this bill went further. There is still a need for other funding, because state or private funding would be needed to fund deriving the stem cells.

California and New Jersey have already set up funding sources for embryonic stem cell research, and a number of other states have announced intentions to fund this research. We must ensure that all entities can work together. Scientists still need funding for the aspects of research that the Federal government will not cover.

Today, I am introducing a resolution that expresses the sense of Congress that the Federal government should not infringe on states or private organizations that fund embryonic stem cell research. I hope that my colleagues will show support for all embryonic research, by supporting my resolution.

Many of us have family members suffering from devastating illnesses, and the prospect of helping them to be healthy and free of pain is a worthy goal. Make no mistake; this goal is what we are debating today.

ENTICINGLY CLOSE . . . YET PAINFULLY FAR
(By Brooke Ellison)

The ability to view the world through another's eyes is the essence of altruism. When putting their pens to the paper of policy, those who legislate ought to take into keen consideration the world as it is seen through others' eyes, wrought with the problems they face and conditions they endure. This is the basic tenet of a representative democracy, the basic belief upon which the United States was founded. Yet, despite this underlying and widely accepted notion of several voices speaking on behalf of many, this does not always appear to be the case and, in fact, those making collective decisions can become inextricably linked to their own, myopic ideology, failing to understand the situations of others or hear their voices.

In September of 1990, when I was eleven years old, I was hit by a car while walking home from my first day of 7th grade. That accident left me paralyzed from my neck down and dependent on a ventilator for every breath I take. Living as a person with a physical disability or debilitating disease, each day is a struggle. Tasks that, to others, might seem mundane or be taken for granted

are strenuous challenges, sometimes taking long hours instead of mere minutes, causing frustration both from what cannot be at present and potential being lost in the future. When we place our hopes and visions for our world into the hands of those making broad decisions, we do it with the belief that they will act on behalf of our best interest and not on an isolated viewpoint. To do otherwise is bad policy. To undermine the interests of a majority of citizens is bad policy. To ignore the voices and dash the hopes of those most in need is bad policy. In the context of stem cell research legislation, these are bad policies, yet policies that are being upheld. This forces millions to wonder things like, "If I could be freed from the confines of my physical condition, what a miracle it would be." Or, "If, for an entire day, I could once again be completely whole and my body was somehow irrelevant, what a renewed gift that would be." Or, maybe, "If, for a single moment, I could wrap my arms around those I love, what a treasure that would be." And even, "If, by some chance, those making policy decisions might heed some of my recurrent thoughts and change their stance on stem cell research, what a potentially groundbreaking step it would be." The reality is that, based on current federal legislation, these "ifs" likely won't change into "thens".

On August 9th, 2001, from his ranch in Crawford, Texas, President Bush announced that he would significantly limit federal funds to stem cell research, only agreeing to fund research conducted on to stem cell lines already in existence at the time. According to this limitation, federally supported research could be done on no more than 78 existing genetic cell lines, although even the most optimistic estimates of viable cells were estimated to be far fewer, less than two dozen. To the delight of some and the grief of others, Mr. Bush indicated that the use of embryonic cells for medical research was a violation of the sanctity of life, analogous to abortion or euthanasia. In the President's own words, "I worry about a culture that devalues life, and believe as your President I have an important obligation to foster and encourage respect for life in America and throughout the world. . . . Embryonic stem cell research offers both great promise and great peril. So I have decided we must proceed with great care". Despite millions of testimonies and pleas to the contrary since that day, over three years ago, the opinion of the administration has remained constant and has not eased any restrictions. Despite strides being made in other countries around the world in the field of stem cell research, the U.S. government has remained resolute in its opposition to it.

Research that holds so much promise for so many now remains unsupported by the federal government. Similar to other issues facing our nation today, the decision of whether or not to fund embryonic stem cell research is now left in the hands of the States, with the Legislatures and Governors picking up where the U.S. Congress and President have left off. California, with its Proposition 71, has been the most recent State to make substantive progress on the issue, passing a referendum to support research conducted in the state. California joins New Jersey in leading the charge for state-funded stem cell research. But the cause should not and must not stop there, as two States out of our fifty is simply not enough. With researchers, scientists, and human lives waiting in the wings for advances, opportunity wasted is opportunity lost.

Therapeutic stem cell research, also known as somatic cell nuclear transfer, has the potential to provide cures for a considerable

number of neurological and degenerative conditions, including Alzheimer's disease, Parkinson's disease, childhood leukemia, heart disease, ALS, several different types of cancer, and spinal cord injuries. In its most basic description, stem cells are the undifferentiated, unspecialized cells that can be extracted from embryos in their earliest stages of development, three to five days after fertilization. The embryos, known in this initial developmental form as blastocysts, contain only about 30 cells. Importantly, the cells taken from the blastocysts can be placed in different conditions to become other types of cells, such as heart muscle or nerve tissue, which can be used to repair similar damaged tissue in children and adults. The procedure has the potential to affect directly the lives of nearly 100 million Americans who face different conditions, equaling over one-third of the U.S. population and more than the entire populations of New York, California, Texas, and Florida, combined. As complex as embryonic stem cell research is in its design, it is equally so in its moral debate. Therapeutic stem cell research can sometimes be confused with reproductive stem cell procedures, such as genetic engineering, which have sparked controversy in some political camps. The two types of research differ considerably, though, both in terms of procedure and intent, and represent two diverse ends on a very long, complex spectrum—an understanding which often goes ignored.

Well, some have argued, isn't using stem cells just the destruction of one life for the sake of another? Aren't we simply judging some lives as more important than others? To hold such a belief is to view the world in black and white terms, thereby ignoring the much more complex gray areas. Yes, it is possible that, if a blastocyst, from where stems cells are derived, were to be inserted into a womb and allowed to grow for nine months there is the potential a life could be born. However, that is not the case for any of the blastocysts that yield stem cells that are used for research. These blastocysts are those that will go unused after in vitro fertilization procedures and will never be used to bring about life. These blastocysts, which some proclaim represent the sanctity of life, will only be kept in freezers at fertility clinics until they have expired and then will be discarded completely. Under current federal legislation, they are of no use to anybody.

To rob the stem cells of their other potential of life, which is to cure diseases or to help regenerate parts of the body that are not regenerating on their own, is really to devalue life in another, otherwise avoidable way.

Well, others have argued, isn't the work done on stem cells just the same as cloning? Aren't these cells essentially promoting the creation of another person? The once almost incomprehensible, futuristic ideas of "cloning" and "body-doubles" are now considered feasible and fearsome possibilities, and therapeutic stem cell research has been the unwitting victim of the prevalent fears. Orwell's 1984 has somehow come to life in 2004, with the speculations made by some of about unintended, science-fiction consequences. But, the connection between human reproduction and human therapy is a foggy one at best. The real fear, though, is not the potential of mad scientists reproducing people but the lost potential of sound scientists curing people.

Fourteen years ago, I could have never imagined having to advocate for something that could potentially restore for me the very basic aspects of life and humanity. But, that is something that no one should have to imagine. Science has given medicine more promise than ever before, with the potential

to heal and restore people in ways once unfathomable. Stem cells, which would otherwise serve no other purpose, hold the promise of life, not just for the newly born but now for the already living and this opportunity must be seized. The time is now. If the federal government chooses not to do it, then the States must tend to it, themselves. The time has come when we can change the lives of so many, giving to them the fundamental parts of life and dignity.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 810, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act.

Scientific and biomedical research and innovation has made our Nation and our world a safer and healthier place. Advances in medicine have made virtually obsolete killer diseases like smallpox and polio, have increased life expectancy and improved the quality of life for people around the globe. From Roman times around 2000 years ago to 1900 life expectancy increased from 25 to 47 years of age. However, because of important discoveries and advances in medicine and medical treatments, by the year 2000 life expectancy had increased to over 76 years of age.

The advances in medicine that resulted in this dramatic increase in life expectancy did not happen by accident. They occurred as a result of visionary leadership in both the public and private sectors. They occurred as a result of political will and public capital. They occurred because of the private sector's ability to convert government funded basic research into life-saving applications. Government funded basic research has and continues to serve as the foundation for the medical advances that have improved the health and quality of life for millions of people.

While the advances we have made in medicine in the last century have been both impressive and historic, we have a long way to go. Far too many people in our society suffer from debilitating diseases like Parkinson's, Alzheimer's and diabetes for which there are no cures. The scientific community overwhelmingly believes that embryonic stem cell research holds the potential for medical advances and therapies that could make these and other diseases as obsolete as polio and small pox, and the National Institutes of Health have proposed an ethically sound policy to further this research. I support Federal funding for embryonic stem cell research because without it we run the risk of missing an historic opportunity to improve the lives of millions of North Carolinians, Americans and people around the world. Without Federal funding for this basic research we could condemn millions of human beings to the pain, misery and suffering of debilitating and degenerative diseases that otherwise might be cured.

I understand that many of the opponents of this legislation have moral qualms about using embryos for research. But the embryos covered under this legislation would otherwise be discarded, so defeat of this legislation would do nothing to assuage moral difficulties surrounding destruction of embryos. And defeat of this legislation would deny innocent victims of terrible diseases the opportunity of relief from their suffering and healing of their afflictions. I support funding for this research because of the bright promise it holds to make life better and more productive for generations to come.

Our North Carolina values guide us to expand scientific and medical knowledge to en-

hance the health and well being of our families, neighbors and fellow citizens, and this research is key to that effort.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act.

The American people need and want a carefully crafted stem cell research policy that allows us to seek scientific breakthroughs.

We do not have such a policy today. The stem cell policy established by President Bush is severely restrictive and arbitrary. The National Institutes of Health has reported that of the 78 stem cell lines promised by President Bush, only 22 lines meet the President's criteria for use. A number of those lines have developed genetic mutations which will make research on them useless. The vast majority of the remaining usable lines are in other countries that have shown little interest in making them available to U.S. researchers. As a result, our researchers are falling behind their counterparts in other countries, and our citizens are watching their hopes for cures within their lifetimes slip away.

What is at stake are potential cures for diseases such as Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, diabetes and cancer.

The Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act expands the number of stem cell lines that are available for federally funded research. The bill also implements strong ethical requirements on stem cell lines that would be eligible for federally funded research.

This is an issue that can impact families across America, crossing all lines of income, political persuasion or religious affiliation. Furthermore, delay in effectively resolving this issue could for countless Americans be a matter of basic health or indeed life. Keeping in mind the essential federal role in critical basic health research, I believe that it is essential that we support this bill so our country can continue in the lead in exploring the frontiers of science and medicine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Monday, May 23, 2005, the bill is considered read for amendment and the previous question is ordered.

The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. CASTLE. 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, this 15-minute vote on passage of H.R. 810 will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

suspending the rules and passing H.R. 2520; and

suspending the rules and passing H.R. 1224, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 194, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 204]

YEAS—238

Abercrombie	Ford	Neal (MA)
Ackerman	Fossella	Obey
Allen	Frank (MA)	Olver
Andrews	Frelinghuysen	Ortiz
Baca	Gerlach	Owens
Baird	Gibbons	Pallone
Baldwin	Gilchrest	Pascrell
Barrow	Gonzalez	Pastor
Barton (TX)	Gordon	Payne
Bass	Granger	Pelosi
Bean	Green, Al	Platts
Becerra	Green, Gene	Pomeroy
Berkley	Grijalva	Porter
Berman	Gutierrez	Price (NC)
Berry	Harman	Pryce (OH)
Biggert	Hastings (FL)	Ramstad
Bishop (GA)	Herseth	Rangel
Bishop (NY)	Higgins	Regula
Blumenauer	Hinchey	Reyes
Boehlert	Hinojosa	Rohrabacher
Bono	Holt	Ross
Boren	Honda	Rothman
Boswell	Hooley	Royal-Allard
Boucher	Hoyer	Ruppersberger
Boyd	Inslee	Rush
Bradley (NH)	Israel	Ryan (OH)
Brady (PA)	Issa	Sabo
Brown (OH)	Jackson (IL)	Salazar
Brown, Corrine	Jackson-Lee	Sánchez, Linda
Brown-Waite,	(TX)	T.
Ginny	Jefferson	Sanchez, Loretta
Butterfield	Johnson (CT)	Sanders
Calvert	Johnson, E. B.	Schakowsky
Capito	Jones (OH)	Schiff
Capps	Kanjorski	Schwartz (PA)
Capuano	Kelly	Schwarz (MI)
Cardin	Kennedy (RI)	Scott (GA)
Cardoza	Kilpatrick (MI)	Scott (VA)
Carnahan	Kind	Serrano
Carson	Kirk	Shaw
Case	Kolbe	Shays
Castle	Kucinich	Sherman
Chandler	Langevin	Simmons
Clay	Lantos	Skelton
Cleaver	Larsen (WA)	Slaughter
Clyburn	Larson (CT)	Smith (WA)
Coble	LaTourette	Snyder
Conyers	Leach	Solis
Cooper	Lee	Spratt
Costa	Levin	Stark
Cramer	Lewis (CA)	Strickland
Crowley	Lewis (GA)	Sweeney
Cuellar	Lofgren, Zoe	Tanner
Cummings	Lowey	Tauscher
Cunningham	Lynch	Thomas
Davis (AL)	Mack	Thompson (CA)
Davis (CA)	Maloney	Thompson (MS)
Davis (FL)	Markey	Tierney
Davis (IL)	Matheson	Towns
Davis, Tom	Matsui	Udall (CO)
DeFazio	McCarthy	Udall (NM)
DeGette	McCollum (MN)	Upton
Delahunt	McDermott	Van Hollen
DeLauro	McGovern	Velázquez
Dent	McKeon	Visclosky
Dicks	McKinney	Walden (OR)
Dingell	McNulty	Wasserman
Doggett	Meehan	Schultz
Doyle	Meek (FL)	Waters
Dreier	Meeks (NY)	Watson
Edwards	Melancon	Watt
Emanuel	Menendez	Waxman
Emerson	Michaud	Weiner
Engel	Miller (NC)	Wexler
Eshoo	Miller, George	Wilson (NM)
Etheridge	Moore (KS)	Woolsey
Evans	Moore (WI)	Wu
Farr	Moran (VA)	Wynn
Fattah	Murtha	Young (AK)
Filner	Nadler	Young (FL)
Foley	Napolitano	

NAYS—194

Aderholt	Bonilla	Chabot
Akin	Bonner	Chocola
Alexander	Boozman	Cole (OK)
Bachus	Boustany	Conaway
Baker	Brady (TX)	Costello
Barrett (SC)	Brown (SC)	Cox
Bartlett (MD)	Burgess	Crenshaw
Beauprez	Burton (IN)	Cubin
Bilirakis	Buyer	Culberson
Bishop (UT)	Camp	Davis (KY)
Blackburn	Cannon	Davis (TN)
Blunt	Cantor	Davis, Jo Ann
Boehner	Carter	Deal (GA)

DeLay	Kennedy (MN)	Pickering	Barton (TX)	Duncan	King (IA)	Peterson (PA)	Sanders	Thomas
Diaz-Balart, L.	Kildee	Pitts	Bass	Eldwars	King (NY)	Petri	Saxton	Thompson (CA)
Diaz-Balart, M.	King (IA)	Poe	Bean	Ehlers	Kingston	Pickering	Schakowsky	Thompson (MS)
Doolittle	King (NY)	Pombo	Beauprez	Emanuel	Kirk	Pitts	Schiff	Thornberry
Drake	Kingston	Price (GA)	Becerra	Emerson	Kline	Platts	Schwartz (PA)	Tiahrt
Duncan	Kline	Putnam	Berkley	Engel	Knollenberg	Poe	Schwarz (MI)	Tiberi
Ehlers	Knollenberg	Radanovich	Berman	English (PA)	Kolbe	Pombo	Scott (GA)	Tierney
English (PA)	Kuhl (NY)	Rahall	Berry	Eshoo	Kucinich	Pomeroy	Scott (VA)	Towns
Everett	LaHood	Rehberg	Biggert	Etheridge	Kuhl (NY)	Porter	Sensenbrenner	Turner
Feeney	Latham	Reichert	Bilirakis	Evans	LaHood	Price (GA)	Serrano	Udall (CO)
Ferguson	Lewis (KY)	Renzi	Bishop (GA)	Everett	Langevin	Price (NC)	Sessions	Udall (NM)
Fitzpatrick (PA)	Linder	Reynolds	Bishop (NY)	Farr	Lantos	Pryce (OH)	Shadegg	Upton
Flake	Lipinski	Rogers (AL)	Bishop (UT)	Fattah	Larsen (WA)	Putnam	Shaw	Van Hollen
Forbes	LoBiondo	Rogers (KY)	Blackburn	Feeney	Larson (CT)	Radanovich	Shays	Velázquez
Fortenberry	Lucas	Rogers (MI)	Blumenauer	Ferguson	Latham	Rahall	Sherman	Visclosky
Fox	Lungren, Daniel	Ros-Lehtinen	Blunt	Filner	LaTourette	Ramstad	Sherwood	Walden (OR)
Franks (AZ)	E.	Royce	Boehlert	Fitzpatrick (PA)	Leach	Rangel	Shimkus	Walsh
Gallely	Manzullo	Ryan (WI)	Boehner	Flake	Lee	Regula	Shuster	Wamp
Garrett (NJ)	Marchant	Ryun (KS)	Bonilla	Foley	Levin	Rehberg	Simmons	Wasserman
Gillmor	Marshall	Saxton	Bonner	Forbes	Lewis (CA)	Reichert	Simpson	Wasserman
Gingrey	McCaul (TX)	Sensenbrenner	Bono	Ford	Lewis (GA)	Renzi	Skelton	Schultz
Gohmert	McCotter	Sessions	Boozman	Fortenberry	Lewis (KY)	Reyes	Slaughter	Waters
Goode	McCrery	Shadegg	Boren	Fossella	Linder	Reynolds	Smith (NJ)	Watson
Goodlatte	McHenry	Sherwood	Boswell	Fox	Lipinski	Rogers (AL)	Smith (TX)	Watt
Graves	McHugh	Shimkus	Boucher	Frank (MA)	LoBiondo	Rogers (KY)	Smith (WA)	Waxman
Green (WI)	McIntyre	Shuster	Boustany	Franks (AZ)	Lofgren, Zoe	Rogers (MI)	Snyder	Weiner
Gutknecht	McMorris	Simpson	Boyd	Frelinghuysen	Lowe	Rohrabacher	Sodrel	Weldon (FL)
Hall	Mica	Smith (NJ)	Bradley (NH)	Gallely	Lucas	Ros-Lehtinen	Solis	Weldon (PA)
Harris	Miller (FL)	Smith (TX)	Brady (PA)	Garrett (NJ)	Lungren, Daniel	Rothman	Souder	Weller
Hart	Miller (MI)	Sodrel	Brady (TX)	Gerlach	E.	Stark	Spratt	Westmoreland
Hastert	Miller, Gary	Souder	Brown (OH)	Gibbons	Lynch	Roybal-Allard	Stark	Wexler
Hayes	Mollohan	Stearns	Brown (SC)	Gilchrest	Mack	Royce	Stearns	Whitfield
Hayworth	Moran (KS)	Stupak	Brown, Corrine	Gillmor	Maloney	Ruppersberger	Strickland	Wicker
Hefley	Murphy	Sullivan	Brown-Waite,	Gingrey	Manzullo	Rush	Murphy	Wick
Hensarling	Musgrave	Tancredo	Ginny	Gohmert	Marchant	Ryan (OH)	Rush	Wilson (NM)
Herger	Myrick	Taylor (MS)	Burgess	Gonzalez	Markey	Ryan (WI)	Sullivan	Wilson (SC)
Hobson	Neugebauer	Taylor (NC)	Burton (IN)	Goode	Marshall	Ryun (KS)	Sweeney	Wolf
Hoekstra	Ney	Terry	Butterfield	Goodlatte	Matheson	Sabo	Tancredo	Wolf
Holden	Northup	Thornberry	Buzer	Gordon	Matsui	Salazar	Tanner	Woolsey
Hostettler	Norwood	Tiahrt	Granger	Granger	McCarthy	Sánchez, Linda	Tauscher	Wu
Hulshof	Nunes	Tiberi	Camp	Graves	McCaul (TX)	T.	Taylor (MS)	Wynn
Hunter	Nussle	Turner	Cannon	Green (WI)	McCollum (MN)	Sanchez, Loretta	Taylor (NC)	Young (AK)
Hyde	Oberstar	Walsh	Cantor	Green, Al	McCotter		Terry	Young (FL)
Inglis (SC)	Osborne	Wamp	Capito	Green, Gene	McCrery			
Istook	Otter	Weldon (FL)	Capps	Grijalva	McDermott			
Jenkins	Oxley	Weldon (PA)	Capuano	Gutierrez	McGovern			
Jindal	Paul	Weller	Cardin	Gutknecht	McHenry			
Johnson (IL)	Pearce	Westmoreland	Cardoza	Hall	McHugh			
Johnson, Sam	Pence	Whitfield	Carnahan	Harman	McIntyre			
Jones (NC)	Peterson (MN)	Wicker	Carson	Harris	McKeon			
Kaptur	Peterson (PA)	Wilson (SC)	Carter	Hart	McKinney			
Keller	Petri	Wolf	Case	Hastert	McMorris			
			Castle	Hastings (FL)	McNulty			
			Chabot	Hayes	Meehan			
			Chandler	Hayworth	Meek (FL)			
			Chocola	Hefley	Meeks (NY)			
			Clay	Hensarling	Melancon			
			Cleaver	Herger	Menendez			
			Clyburn	Herseth	Mica			
			Coble	Higgins	Michaud			
			Cole (OK)	Hinche	Miller (FL)			
			Conaway	Hinojosa	Miller (MI)			
			Conyers	Hobson	Miller (NC)			
			Cooper	Hoekstra	Miller, Gary			
			Costa	Holden	Miller, George			
			Costello	Holt	Mollohan			
			Cox	Honda	Moore (KS)			
			Cramer	Hooley	Moore (WI)			
			Crenshaw	Hostettler	Moran (KS)			
			Crowley	Hoyer	Moran (VA)			
			Cubin	Hulshof	Murphy			
			Cuellar	Hunter	Murtha			
			Culberson	Hyde	Musgrave			
			Cummings	Inglis (SC)	Myrick			
			Cunningham	Inlee	Nadler			
			Davis (AL)	Israel	Napolitano			
			Davis (CA)	Issa	Neal (MA)			
			Davis (FL)	Istook	Neugebauer			
			Davis (IL)	Jackson (IL)	Ney			
			Davis (KY)	Jackson-Lee	Northup			
			Davis (TN)	(TX)	Norwood			
			Davis, Jo Ann	Jefferson	Nunes			
			Davis, Tom	Jenkins	Nussle			
			Deal (GA)	Jindal	Oberstar			
			DeFazio	Johnson (CT)	Obey			
			DeGette	Johnson (IL)	Oliver			
			DeLahunt	Johnson, E. B.	Ortiz			
			DeLauro	Johnson, Sam	Osborne			
			DeLay	Jones (NC)	Otter			
			Dent	Jones (OH)	Owens			
			Diaz-Balart, L.	Kanjorski	Oxley			
			Diaz-Balart, M.	Kaptur	Pallone			
			Dicks	Keller	Pascrell			
			Dingell	Kelly	Pastor			
			Doggett	Kennedy (MN)	Payne			
			Doolittle	Kennedy (RI)	Pearce			
			Doyle	Kildee	Pelosi			
			Drake	Kilpatrick (MI)	Pence			
			Dreier	Kind	Peterson (MN)			

NOT VOTING—2

Hastings (WA) Millender-McDonald

□ 1807

Ms. CARSON and Mr. BUTTERFIELD changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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 THERAPEUTIC AND RESEARCH ACT OF 2005

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 2520.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. 2520, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 431, nays 1, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 205]

YEAS—431

Abercrombie	Allen	Baker
Ackerman	Andrews	Baldwin
Aderholt	Baca	Barrett (SC)
Akin	Bachus	Barrow
Alexander	Baird	Bartlett (MD)

Castle	Hastings (FL)	McMorris
Chabot	Hayes	McNulty
Chandler	Hayworth	Meehan
Chocola	Hefley	Meek (FL)
Clay	Hensarling	Meeks (NY)
Cleaver	Herger	Melancon
Clyburn	Herseth	Menendez
Coble	Higgins	Mica
Cole (OK)	Hinche	Michaud
Conaway	Hinojosa	Miller (FL)
Conyers	Hobson	Miller (MI)
Cooper	Hoekstra	Miller (NC)
Costa	Holden	Miller, Gary
Costello	Holt	Miller, George
Cox	Honda	Mollohan
Cramer	Hooley	Moore (KS)
Crenshaw	Hostettler	Moore (WI)
Crowley	Hoyer	Moran (KS)
Cubin	Hulshof	Moran (VA)
Cuellar	Hunter	Murphy
Culberson	Hyde	Murtha
Cummings	Inglis (SC)	Musgrave
Cunningham	Inlee	Myrick
Davis (AL)	Israel	Nadler
Davis (CA)	Issa	Napolitano
Davis (FL)	Istook	Neal (MA)
Davis (IL)	Jackson (IL)	Neugebauer
Davis (KY)	Jackson-Lee	Ney
Davis (TN)	(TX)	Northup
Davis, Jo Ann	Jefferson	Norwood
Davis, Tom	Jenkins	Nunes
Deal (GA)	Jindal	Nussle
DeFazio	Johnson (CT)	Oberstar
DeGette	Johnson (IL)	Obey
DeLahunt	Johnson, E. B.	Oliver
DeLauro	Johnson, Sam	Ortiz
DeLay	Jones (NC)	Osborne
Dent	Jones (OH)	Otter
Diaz-Balart, L.	Kanjorski	Owens
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kaptur	Oxley
Dicks	Keller	Pallone
Dingell	Kelly	Pascrell
Doggett	Kennedy (MN)	Pastor
Doolittle	Kennedy (RI)	Payne
Doyle	Kildee	Pearce
Drake	Kilpatrick (MI)	Pelosi
Dreier	Kind	Pence
		Peterson (MN)

NAYS—1

Paul

NOT VOTING—2

Hastings (WA) Millender-McDonald

□ 1817

So (two thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BUSINESS CHECKING FREEDOM ACT OF 2005

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1224, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1224, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 424, nays 1, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 206]

YEAS—424

Abercrombie	Andrews	Barrett (SC)
Ackerman	Baca	Barrow
Aderholt	Bachus	Bartlett (MD)
Akin	Baird	Barton (TX)
Alexander	Baker	Bass
Allen	Baldwin	Bean