

multinational state put together by the British for administrative convenience. Their claims ignore India's history, its independence movement, and the principles on which India was founded.

India was founded as a secular state based on an equality of religions. Secularism is the thread that holds together the fabric of diversity that characterizes India. Muslims and Sikhs do not need to secede from such a nation. Secession based on religion or any other ideological principle goes against the secularism that India stands for, and it is the secularism that India cannot afford to compromise in its fight for democracy.

Mr. Speaker, a divided India is a recipe for chaos. A peaceful and smooth transition to a split India is not feasible. With the diverse array of regions, 18 official languages and 17 freedom movements in India, the breakdown of India would be disruptive for its people and the international community. A divided India is more susceptible to outside influence and the possible resurgence of colonialism. For a country such as India, unity is its strength.

While a joint agreement may not have come out of the India-Pakistan summit in July, we must realize that India has a sincere desire to improve relations with its neighbors. A united and strong India is a necessary prerequisite for cultivating a positive relationship with not only Pakistan, but all of South Asia.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, we are once again approaching a national discussion with the regard to the issue of immigration, and I am glad we are doing so because it is, of course, an important one.

I am concerned because many times this particular issue is one that we are reluctant to deal with. We are reluctant on the floor of the House; we are reluctant oftentimes in the court of public opinion to discuss the issue of immigration or immigration reform for fear that somehow or other our concerns on this particular topic would be interpreted as being either anti-immigrant or racist in nature.

But it is a fact, Mr. Speaker, that it is one of the most significant and perplexing problems we face as a Nation. It is, I think, one of the most serious of the domestic policy issues that we face as a Nation, because it affects us in a variety of ways. Massive immigration into the United States, especially massive numbers of illegal immigrants into the United States, cause a number of problems. They cause problems not just for people in the United States, but they cause problems even for those coming in.

We have heard, of course, many times of the situations that have occurred as people have come across the border, have been taken advantage of either by people on this side or on the other side of the border, people who charge large sums of money for taking people into the United States illegally; and then when these folks get here, they are oftentimes taken advantage of by employers who know that they can pay them lower than the going rate for wages, they can withhold benefits, they can do all of this because the employee being illegally here cannot do, or refuses, or is fearful of, doing anything about it. So it is bad for the person coming across the border, and it is bad for people here for a variety of reasons.

Massive numbers of people coming across the border, legally and illegally, low-skilled and, therefore, low-wage earners, have a depressing effect on the income of low-income people in the United States. It is difficult for people here to get jobs sometimes; it is certainly difficult for them to compete with people who are working for even lower than minimum wage levels.

But there are even more important and pressing problems that we face in this country as a result of massive immigration, and those problems deal specifically with the cost of infrastructure that has to be developed and created in response to the growing numbers of people in the country.

We have time and time and time again talked about the problems that the Nation faces as a result of an energy crisis. Yesterday, this House, to its credit, passed the President's bill, an energy reform proposal that hopefully will bring us a long way towards solving the energy crisis that we face in this Nation. But why do we face the crisis, is the concern that we should all have.

Why is it that there is not enough energy to go around? Well, the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the problem is a direct result of the numbers of people that we have coming across the borders in the United States.

The massive numbers of illegal immigrants and legal immigrants have increased the population of the United States dramatically over the last 10 years. According to the United States Census, immigration accounts for over 55 percent of the population increase in the country. As a result, there are, of course, lots of pressures that are brought about in terms of infrastructural costs.

Recently, we have witnessed something else happen. We have witnessed a proposal on the part of a Working Group in the White House, a proposal to provide amnesty to at least 3.5 million Mexicans who are here illegally. Now, that is peculiar in many ways.

First of all, we tried this once before. In 1986, we proposed and, in fact, adopted an amnesty plan. It was designed at that time to reduce the number of illegal aliens coming into the country, to help us get a grip on our immigration

problem. It, of course, did not work. It did exactly what we would assume it would do, Mr. Speaker. It encouraged many millions of others to come into the country illegally in the hopes that they too, in time, would be given the opportunity to be legalized because of their illegal activity, I mean as bizarre as that sounds, as incongruous as that sounds, as illogical as that sounds. But, nonetheless, we have done that.

I am concerned about this proposal, and I do hope that we will eventually strike it down.

EMBRYONIC STEM CELL RESEARCH

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to come to the well tonight to talk a little bit about an issue that has gotten a lot of attention here on the floor, lots of talk and lots of rhetoric, and that is the whole question of embryonic stem cell research. I am a physician and I know firsthand about taking care of these people; I know about health and the issues of morality, and I have devoted my life to trying to improve the health and well-being of individuals, both in the Congress and in the legislature, as well as in my office.

As a physician, I was trained almost 40 years ago, and I am amazed by the medical progress which has occurred over the last few decades. It is hard to believe that in 1924, the President of the United States' son died because he was playing tennis, he developed a blister on his heel, got an infection, and died. That certainly was before antibiotics; it could not happen today. The last 50 years have seen an absolute explosion of medical technology and knowledge in this whole arena.

In the new millennium, the issue that is of the most importance and the most promise is the whole area of stem cells. These are the most primary, primitive cells in the human body that start out as one cell and they become human beings. When we think about the things that can be done with stem cells, the possibilities are unlimited, although our knowledge is limited at this point.

□ 2350

We have to be able to imagine a day when somebody like Lou Gehrig would have a stem cell treatment that would allow him to live. People like that are hopeless at this point, and stem cell research gives them some hope. I have taken care of people like this, with Parkinson's disease, with Lou Gehrig's disease, Huntington's Chorea, paralysis, blindness, diabetes, and spinal cord injuries.

I put this picture up of Christopher Reeve, Superman, who was riding a horse, broke his neck, and is now paralyzed. This young girl next to him is

also paralyzed. These are the people we are talking about finding some help for. Right now, there is no help for either one of them, no hope that they will ever be able to walk again.

Stem cells, as I say, are the most undifferentiated cells. When given the proper signals, they become any specialized cell in the body: brain, blood, liver, lung. The opportunities are unlimited.

There are three sources of these stem cells: adult stem cells; that is, stem cells we would get out of my body or any other adult's body that are operating in the bone marrow to produce blood or something like that; fetal stem cells, that is in babies that are in the womb and/or developing fetuses that are in the womb and for one reason or another are born either naturally or some other way because of an elective procedure; or the third way is from embryos.

Now, how does an embryo come about? People sort of say, where do they come from? Our research right now under the National Institutes of Health in embryonic research is controlled by very strict guidelines. This administration stepped in and stopped what has been going on in this country for the last 8 years.

The question we have to ask ourselves is, why is this? Now, my belief is that it has nothing to do with science, it really is a moratorium on for political reasons. Let me explain why I say that.

The embryonic stem cells come from in vitro fertilization clinics. There are people out there who try to have children in the normal manner and it does not work, so they go to a clinic, and the woman goes through a procedure by which she creates a number of eggs. They are extracted from her body and put in a test tube. The man puts his semen in the test tube, and we start a baby to develop.

Now, that baby, the doctor harvests, and that is the term they use, harvests three eggs, so you have three test tubes. You put these eggs in there and you fertilize them and you start out a child.

When the time comes for the woman to get pregnant, they take one of those and put it in the woman's uterus, and hopefully it takes. If the first one takes, we now only have two left. The question is, what do we do with those? We can throw them away, or we can let them be used for this research.

My belief is that the possibilities are so great that we must continue this research. Throughout history, people have resisted scientific advancement. History is replete with examples of fundamentalist, religious leaders issuing scientific decisions based on absolutely no evidence.

I want to talk today about embryonic stem cell research. There has been a lot of rhetoric out there denying its therapeutic potential, questioning its morality, focusing on adult stem cells, and so on.

I am a physician. I know first-hand about health and morality. I have devoted my life to

improving the health and well-being of people—on an individual level as a practicing physician, and through health policy—both in the Washington State legislature and here in Congress.

As a physician who trained roughly 40 years ago, I am amazed by the medical progress just over the past few decades. In the first half of this century, an infected blister could kill, as it did to President Coolidge's 16-year-old son in 1924, following a tennis match at the White House. The last 50 years have borne witness to such an explosion of scientific and medical advances that have saved countless lives and alleviated human suffering.

As we enter the new millennium, stem cell research is the wave of the future in biomedical research.

So much of what I learned in medical school has changed. The untreatable afflictions can be treated, if we just allow science to progress. Imagine the day when Lou Gehrig's Disease is not associated with a miserable and certain death. Think about diabetic children no longer requiring multiple pin-pricks throughout each and every day for the rest of his/her life in order to survive. Picture paralyzed individuals standing up and walking away from their wheelchairs.

I have taken care of patients with many of these afflictions. I have friends who have suffered and some that have died.

Embryonic stem cell research offers unprecedented promise for these and so many devastating diseases and disabilities—Parkinson's disease, ALS, Huntington's Chorea, paralysis, blindness, diabetes—the list is endless. Stem cells are undifferentiated cells, which, given the proper signal, are potentially capable of becoming any specialized cell, such as a brain or blood cell. As such, their potential for saving lives is unlimited.

There are three sources of stem cells—adult, fetal and embryo. Under the Clinton Administration, the National Institutes of Health issued explicit guidelines for research involving stem cells derived from embryos. The guidelines provide stringent requirements that enable scientists to conduct stem cell research within the constraints of careful federal oversight and standards.

Currently, the administration has placed a moratorium on these NIH guidelines and is deciding whether or not to shut the doors on the most promising biomedical research of our time.

Throughout history, people have resisted scientific advancement. History is replete with examples of fundamentalist, religious leaders issuing scientific decisions based on absolutely no evidence. It is déjà vu all over again today with this current Administration as they inject politics into the single most promising biomedical research of the century.

The Administration unfortunately is not committed to research that would hasten medical discoveries, but rather holds science hostage to the Catholic vote. As several New York Times articles report, Karl Rove, the president's chief political adviser is concerned about the views of the Catholic Church because Catholic voters are seen as such a swing vote in the elections. The Administration has degraded medical research and the tremendous potential of embryonic stem cell research into an anti-abortion debate.

We cannot allow the current Administration to withdraw federal support for embryonic

stem cell research. It is unconscionable that purely political considerations are obstructing medical discoveries that could help the 120,000 children and one million adults with Type I diabetes; the 500,000 individuals suffering from Parkinson's disease; the 200,000 living day-to-day with the disabling effects of spinal chord injuries; and millions more.

Without a microscope, one cannot even see what this debate is all about. The center of the controversy is a microscopic, days old cluster of cells—this is the embryo.

It is stored in this test tube. It is an egg fertilized by a sperm and stored frozen in one of these—is this life?

I have a question for those who oppose embryonic stem cell research on supposedly "moral grounds"—if you were to pass a home that was on fire and there was a seven year old child in this home, would you risk your life to save that child? I imagine the answer would be yes. If, on the other hand, you passed a fertility clinic that was on fire, would you risk your life to save an embryo? Save one of these test tube?

Embryonic stem cells are developmentally the earliest of all stem cells, and, therefore, they have the greatest potential to become different body cells—greater than adult stem cells. The embryonic stem cell is a unique type of cell that holds the key to cures for so many devastating diseases and afflictions. This is perhaps the first time ever that a solitary source offers so much promise for a multitude of different illnesses.

Limiting crucial research to adult stem cells, a position suggested by the White House and many of my colleagues, is foolishly short-sighted. In fact, the general consensus shared among numerous scientists at a recent National Academy of Science workshop on stem cells was that the evidence for the broad potential of adult stem cells is at best scant.

Despite some reports of success, it is certainly unclear whether adult stem cells have the same promise as embryonic stem cells. First of all, cells for all tissue types have not yet been found in the adult human. Second, genetic disorders would be present in the patient's adult stem cells. Third, all evidence suggests that adult stem cells lack the same capacity to multiply as do embryonic stem cells.

Another compromise suggested by the White House would permit such research but limit it to the very few cell lines already in existence. Not only is this utterly foolish because there is not nearly enough cell lines to make a significant contribution, but it is also hypocritical. These cell lines were most likely not derived in compliance with the NIH guidelines. As the administration is seemingly preoccupied with the morality and ethics of this subject, they may end up advocating research on cell lines that were most likely not derived with any ethical oversight.

Another one of my colleagues has been circulating a Dear Colleague that suggests there is another alternative—that it is possible to remove the embryonic stem cell without destroying the embryo. He refers to a conference attended to by Members and staff at NIH. I was at that conference. The scientists made it abundantly clear that we lack this technology today, and rather, it is years away. We do not have years to waste while we wait.

Some of my colleagues have tried to convince us that there is no clinical evidence to

support human embryonic stem cell research. Well of course not, there is a federal moratorium on the research! These cells were only recently isolated, the first grant applications were due at NIH last March, and then the administration placed everything on hold. If they ever allow the research to proceed with full urgency, there will be clinical success.

Furthermore, my colleagues are regrettably misleading and not up-to-date with the scientific literature. There are in fact numerous studies using animal models that demonstrate the tremendous therapeutic promise of embryonic stem cells. These findings challenge much of what I learned in medical school. For instance, medical dogma for decades accepted no hope for so many neurological disorders.

For example, scientists have been able to transform embryonic stem cells derived from mice into the type of neuron that is defective with Parkinson's disease. We know that these neurons work when placed in animals. That is, when these neurons, which were originally derived from embryonic stem cells, are injected into an animal model of Parkinson's, the animal improves.

Have any doubts? Here is the scientific paper that describes these promising results.

Similarly, researchers have transformed embryonic stem cells into the cell which, when defective causes MS. When this cell was implanted into an animal model with MS, the abnormality was repaired.

And here is a scientific paper that demonstrates those findings.

Both of these examples demonstrate the therapeutic potential of embryonic stem cells. Researchers have taken embryonic stem cells and turned them into a desired cell that works. These cells are implanted into animal models with different illnesses, and the animals get better.

Lets turn to diabetes. This paper describes a study whereby embryonic stem cells are transformed into pancreatic islet stem cells. These islet cells responded to sugar in the right way by producing insulin.

For those who say the evidence is lacking, I say, get your head out of the sand. The evidence most definitely is out there.

The prevailing expert scientific opinion supports a thorough investigation of stem cells from all sources. Even the recently released NIH report recognized the unique potential of embryonic stem cells. But for the White house, it is not about advancing scientific discovery. Instead, their concern for the "swing vote" is their modus operandi. For them, this debate is unfortunately about the next election.

Embryonic stem cells are derived from embryos that are produced during in vitro fertilization, a process that creates many more fertilized eggs than are implanted into women trying to become pregnant. Unused embryos are stored frozen in test tubes and eventually thrown away. Embryonic stem cell research would use only these excess embryos, obtained from fertility clinics and with consent from the donors.

In other words, if the research were not performed, these embryos would be discarded. And how many embryos would be "saved" if the research did not take place? The answer is none. Opponents argue for embryonic adoption. But for the most part, the vast majority of couples do not want to donate their genes to strangers. No policy made in the White House

or in Congress will result in these couples changing their minds.

Thus, we are having a debate over whether to perform life-saving research or to dispose of the embryos and abandon the greatest hope for a cure for so many devastating illnesses.

Those opposed to embryonic stem cell research assert that their position is based on ethical and moral grounds. But what is so ethical or moral about prohibiting research to alleviate human suffering? It is utterly hypocritical and outrageous that the opposition remains silent over the fact that these embryos are thrown away in fertility clinics, but conveys such fury over saving them to perform vital life-saving research.

How can we compare the importance of a group of cells smaller than the dot at the end of this sentence with the poor quality of life and decreased life expectancy for young children with insulin-dependent diabetes? In fact, it is completely amoral to deny access to the single most promising research of today.

The Administration lacks support from many members of its own party, with several conservative pro-life Republicans openly supportive of embryonic stem cell research. When Orin Hatch insists that a frozen embryo stored in a refrigerator in a clinic is not equivalent to an embryo or a fetus in the womb, the Administration's facade of having a commitment to promote innovative medical research is completely undermined.

Banning federal funding for such embryonic stem cell research would not eliminate it. Ironically, such research would then take place in the private market without the benefit of ethical regulation. Under the Clinton Administration, the National Institute of Health issued explicit guidelines for embryonic stem cell research. The guidelines provide stringent requirements that enable scientists to conduct research within the constraints of careful federal oversight.

Prohibiting federal support for embryonic stem cell research will severely impede medical progress. Federal support is critical because it would greatly expand resources. Not only would the government provide crucial funding, but public support also enables multiple parties to simultaneously pursue critical research, thereby increasing the chances for significant discoveries over a shorter period of time. Without federal support, scientific advances would be held hostage to exclusivity rights held by a single entity in the private market.

Furthermore, very few NIH grants were received this past March because investigators fear that the guidelines will be overturned. Without federal support, scientists who work with embryonic stem cells must create a separate lab for such work if they hope to ever receive NIH grants for other areas of research. This is to avoid the possibility of "contaminating" equipment for sanctioned research with that of embryonic stem cell research. The ramifications of banning this research will therefore be felt in scientific discoveries far beyond the stem cell debate.

Actually, we are already witnessing the consequences, as the exodus of our best and brightest minds has begun. A few weeks ago, UCSF (University of California at San Francisco) lost a leading stem cell researcher who moved to Cambridge, England. He left so that he can proceed with his work. As the university's chancellor for medical affairs said: "If

federal support for stem cell research is not forthcoming, the risk exists that talented scientists will leave academic centers to seek opportunities in the private sector or even overseas."

America has been on the forefront of scientific discovery. The administration is jeopardizing our position and taking us several steps backward to assuage the fundamentalist attitudes of the minority.

The White House is currently "reviewing" the matter; in other words, they are assessing the polls and the impact of any decision on the 2004 elections. It is not secret that Mr. Rove has consulted the National Conference of Catholic Bishops on this issue. Enough time has been wasted. The Administration must act now to separate political aspirations from scientific discovery.

"A responsible leader is someone who makes decisions based upon principle, not based upon polls or focus groups." The New York Times reminds us that President Bush spoke these words a few days before Election Day. Perhaps someone should remind the President.

I implore my colleagues and this administration to support embryonic stem cell research. Furthermore, I urge you to support my bill—"The Stem Cell Research Act of 2001" (H.R. 2059). This bill not only supports this crucial research, but it also advocates for federal support of the derivation process itself. That is, instead of relying on private companies to derive the stem cells, we must support and fund this process as well.

I want to close in the issue of morality. Here is a real-life picture of what we are talking about. This is a picture of an embryo, magnified several thousand times. This area here, between the 8 and 10 o'clock position is the area from which stem cells are obtained. It actually contains about 100 cells. There are more cells in a drop of blood from a pin-prick than there are in this one section of the photo.

And here is Mr. Christopher Reeve with a young child—both of whom who were tragically paralyzed.

Are we going to ignore Mr. Reeve and this child? I fervently believe that the moral obligation is to help these individuals and the millions of Americans who are suffering from debilitating illnesses and disabilities. We must focus on those already born who urgently await medical progress.

For the first time ever, cures for so many afflictions that historically have been considered hopeless are now on the horizon. The fact is that embryonic stem cells come from cells that were destined to be discarded in any case. It is high time to separate politics from science.

A FEW THOUGHTS ON ENERGY

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

Mr. EHRLICH. Mr. Speaker, a few thoughts on energy.

Last night we acknowledged our duty as responsible stewards of America's economy in putting forth a sound energy policy that respects and protects our environment.

We adopted a long-term energy strategy, and it was balanced, Mr. Speaker,