

they can compete on an even keel, on an even playing field.

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

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my Special Order at this time.

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

There was no objection.

STEM CELL RESEARCH

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak to this Chamber and address the Speaker and the House.

I would like to speak about the embryonic stem cell research that is a matter of discussion around this Congress intensively in the last weeks and months as we have been here. I would like to join some of my colleagues in explaining the progress and promise of adult stem cell research, and I would like to also dispel many of the myths promoted by those urging more Federal funding for the destruction of human embryos required for embryonic stem cell research. I am for stem cell research, adult stem cell research. I am not for ending human life in the process of trying to find a cure for the lives of others.

Among the favorite myths of proponents of embryonic stem cell research is the legend that there are 400,000 embryos stored at IVF clinics that are simply going to be discarded. So we should derive some benefit from them, my opponents say. This figure has become so fixed in their rhetoric that it now seems to be a fact. Members of both Houses, in a letter to President Bush, even cited the number, the 400,000 number, in an effort to get President Bush to change his current policy on the funding of embryonic stem cell research. These proponents then use that number to create the assumption that an equally large number of therapeutic stem cells can be derived from them.

Here is why this argument is wrong, Mr. Speaker: IVF embryos will not just die anyway. Most IVF embryos are designated for implantation, and the rest can be adopted. In 1995 about 500,000 women were seeking to adopt a child. That would be 500,000 families, most of them husbands and wives. Seventy-five

children are alive and well today who started life as frozen embryos.

All of the frozen embryos have the potential to become an independent, well-adjusted human being. Only a small fraction, 2.2 percent, are slated to be discarded. Only another 2.8 percent of embryos in IVF clinics, that is, roughly 11,000, have been designated by their parents for research. That is a total of 6 percent of all the embryos presently in IVF storage that are intended for disposal or research. Only 6 percent. Ninety percent are designated for a future.

More than 90 percent stored in clinics are saved for later use by parents or donated to other infertile couples for implantation. That means of the original 400,000 frozen embryos, only 11,000 are actually available to be destroyed for their stem cells. Of those available embryos, less than 275 stem cell lines would be created. That can be with private sector dollars. It does not have to be dollars extracted from the taxpayer.

When we are asking the taxpayer to contribute money to the Federal Government and diverting those dollars, Mr. Speaker, to go towards embryonic stem cell research, which of necessity must end a human life, and a human life like those 75 children that have come from frozen embryos to childhood and on their way to adulthood, that is an immoral choice, a choice that we are imposing upon tens of millions of people that understand in this country that life begins at the instance of conception; and we cannot declare an embryo, a fertilized egg, that has all of the chromosomes and all the components of an individual little blessing, we cannot declare them to be something of science to be discarded.

And if we roll ourselves back into history, back to the time of the Second World War, the Nazi regime, Dr. Josef Mengele, he did research on people, people who saw more than half of their world population extinguished by the Nazi regime. He did research on people because they were Jewish and put them in chambers and froze them to death and put them in heat chambers to see how much heat they could stand and put them through a whole series of scientific experiments to find out the limitations of the human body, how much suffering could they take, how much weather could they take, how much deprivation of food and water, how much torture could they take, and documented that. And civil societies have refused to use the information and the data that came from the Nazi regime because it resulted in the death of human beings.

This embryonic stem cell research also results in the death of human beings, Mr. Speaker. It is the same kind of philosophy done in the name of science. We can find and have found better and other ways to produce similar and better science. We need to follow that path. There is no legal prohibition against embryonic stem cell research in this country. The debate in

this Congress is about will we impose a tax upon Americans and compel them to dig into their pockets and contribute to this diabolical science that ends the life of an innocent human being for the potential of improving the life of others when we have other alternatives.

Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to join my colleagues in explaining the progress and promise of adult stem cell research and to dispel many of the myths promoted by those urging more federal funding for the destruction of human embryos, required for embryonic stem cell research.

Among the favorite myths of proponents of embryonic stem cell research is the legend that there are 400,000 embryos stored at IVF clinics that are simply going to be discarded, so we should derive some benefit from them. This figure has become so fixed in their rhetoric that it now seems to be a fact. Members of both Houses, in a letter to President Bush, even cited the number in an effort to get President Bush to change his current policy on the funding of embryonic stem cell research. These proponents then use that number to create the assumption that an equally large number of therapeutic stem cells can be derived from them.

Here is why this argument is wrong: IVF embryos will not just "die anyway." Most IVF embryos are designated for implantation, and the rest can be adopted. In 1995, about 50,000 women were seeking to adopt a child. 75 children are alive and well today who started life as "frozen embryos."

Only a small fraction—2.2 percent—are slated to be discarded.

Only another 2.8 percent of embryos in IVF clinics, roughly 11,000, have been designated by their parents for research.

That is a total of 6 percent of all the embryos presently in IVF storage that are intended for disposal or research. More than 90 percent of embryos stored in IVF clinics are saved for later use by parents or donated to other infertile couples for implantation.

That means of the original 400,000 frozen embryos, only 11,000 are actually available to be destroyed for their stem cells.

Of those available embryos, less than 275 stem cell lines would be created. So, behind the seemingly impressive number of 400,000 frozen embryos, the reality is that the actual number of stem cell lines, likely to be produced from them is so small as to be clinically useless.

In order to treat diseases—which is, as I will explain, still a very distant prospect using human embryonic stem cells—hundreds of thousands more embryos beyond those currently frozen and available for research would be needed. This could only be achieved by a deliberate effort to create new embryos for the sole purpose of destroying them—an outcome that the use of the frozen embryos is supposed to avoid, but would most likely cause. Federal funding of this destructive embryonic stem cell research would, therefore, create an incentive to create and kill more human embryos for stem cells, which would lead to a US human embryo farm industry.

There is an ethical alternative to killing these embryos: Adult and cord blood stem cells are treating patients of over 58 diseases.

Even if these frozen embryos were going to be discarded anyway (which they are not), and even if there was no ethical alternative

(which there is), it would still be morally wrong to kill these human embryos for experimentation.

From the Nuremberg Code to the Belmont Commission, this utilitarian justification for harmful or fatal research has been soundly rejected in order to protect patients and the practice of medicine.

Civilized cultures have protections in place to make sure we do not allow research on, or use organs from, death row prisoners who are "going to die anyway," and we do not do research on terminally ill patients unless such research has a chance to help the patient.

We take a great risk if we dehumanize human embryos and accept "they are going to die anyway" as how we judge what is acceptable treatment for our fellow human beings.

Examples of atrocities that would be justified by the statement that the victims are going to die anyway include: Harvesting organs from and experimenting on death row inmates (like China), harvesting organs from and experimenting on the terminally ill, and submerging 15 live human unborn children into salt solution to learn if they could absorb oxygen through their skin. One fetus survived for 22 hours in an actual U.S. case.

The second major myth is that the stem cells lines that could be derived from these frozen embryos have the potential to cure numerous diseases, but that such cures remain just around the corner and just out of reach because the administration refuses to fund research in which these embryos would be destroyed. This, too, is false.

Adult stem cells have treated over 58 diseases in human patients in published clinical studies. Embryonic stem cells have not treated even one patient, and have mixed results—at best—in animal trials.

Moreover, human embryonic stem cell research is completely legal. The debate is solely about federally funding research that requires the destruction of embryos, human beings in their earliest stages of life.

President Bush is the first president to federally fund human embryonic stem cell research. He determined that such research could be funded so long as the cells had been obtained from embryos destroyed on or before August 9, 2001.

Since then NIH determined that there are 78 derivations of embryonic stem cells that are eligible for Federal funding, and 22 cell lines are currently receiving Federal funds. According to the director of the National Institutes of Health, the Bush policy is sufficient for basic research.

There are 16 additional "eligible" embryonic stem cell lines in existence that have not been "contaminated" by mouse feeder cells.

NIH spent about \$25 million on embryonic stem cell research in 2003, funding 118 research projects.

HHS reports that as of February 2004, embryonic stem cell providers had shipped more than 400 lines to researchers, and there are 3,500 vials of embryonic stem cells that are waiting to be shipped to researchers.

The ultimate goal of researchers is free and unfettered access to Federal dollars to create and destroy embryos for research purposes, and to employ human cloning as the method of choice.

Embryonic stem cell research will not, no matter what the claims of its proponents, become the cure-all it is touted as.

Of the fewer than 275 potential viable stem cell lines genetical diversity will still be lacking,

since minorities are poorly represented among IVF clients.

Stem cells from IVF embryos will cause serious immune rejection problems if transplanted into patients. Researchers argue that to avoid immune rejection, we need to clone people to make stem cells that are genetically identical to the patient receiving the stem cell transplant.

Many of my colleagues, I'm sure, have been visited by members of disease organizations, desperate for cures for their loved ones. One of the myths promoted by some of these organizations—and I believe that the families, most of the time, do not know the falsity of their statements—is that somatic cell nuclear transfer is not cloning. This is absolutely false. Somatic cell nuclear transfer, or SCNT, is the process that created Dolly, the cloned Scottish sheep. This makes me irate, that some in the scientific community would mislead victims of disease and illness and their loved ones into fighting for research they would oppose were they told the truth, and making them believe that this sort of research will cure all that ails them if they were just provided the money.

Here are the facts: All medical advances (at least 58 therapies) from stem cells to date have been from "adult" stem cell research, which carries no ethical concerns. There have been none from embryonic cells, not even in animal studies.

The benefits of research that kills living human embryos is purely speculative and has been hyped by researchers who are after federal funding and by a media that doesn't understand or report the distinction between adult and embryonic stem cells.

Proponents continue to make the false claim that embryonic stem cells will cure Alzheimer's Disease. It almost certainly will not.

The Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation has irresponsibly refused to promote or fund ethical adult stem cell research, despite the fact that it shows far more promise in treating diabetes than does research on cells derived from human embryos.

This debate is purely about federal funding. Embryonic stem cell research is completely legal.

Americans do not support destructive embryonic stem cell research, especially when they are provided with the facts.

When respondents in a poll at the beginning of this month were told that scientists disagree on whether embryonic or adult stem cells will end up being most successful in treating diseases, 60 percent favored funding only the research avenues that raise no moral problem, while only 22 percent favored funding all stem cell research including the kind that involves destroying embryos.

Killing human embryos is morally wrong. A human embryo, a person in his or her earliest stages, must be destroyed to obtain embryonic stem cells. Destroying early human life shows a profound disrespect for human life.

The ends do not justify the means. Some pro-life members of Congress support funding of embryonic stem cell research on the basis that this research could save the lives of people with debilitating diseases. This obfuscation of the term "pro-life" is based on a utilitarian ethic. It is unethical to destroy some human lives for the betterment of the lives of others.

Even President Clinton's National Bioethics Advisory Commission concluded that embryos "deserve respect as a form of human life."

The Commission recommended funding of embryonic stem cell research, only if there were no alternatives. Adult stem cells are currently being used to successfully treat humans suffering from many diseases.

Taxpayers shouldn't spend their hard earned money on embryo destruction. Federal funding of the destruction of human embryos for research is unethical. The debate is over the use of taxpayers money, not whether it is legal. American taxpayers should not be forced to fund unethical research.

The fact is that patients and their loved ones need real hope, not hype. That hope resides in non-controversial, tried-and-true adult stem cell research. When this issue comes to the floor next week, please join me in returning our focus from destructive embryonic stem cell research to adult stem cell research, which has been proven to work, is not morally controversial, and holds true promise for disease victims.

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

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

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the Special Order time of the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER).

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

There was no objection.

CAFTA

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, last year President Bush signed the Central American Free Trade Agreement, a one-sided plan to benefit the largest corporations in the world at the expense of American workers and farmers, and the expense of Central American workers, farmers, and small businesses.

Every trade agreement negotiated by this administration has been ratified by Congress within 65 days of the President's signing it. CAFTA has languished in Congress for nearly 1 year without a vote because this wrong-headed trade agreement offends both Republicans and Democrats.

Just look at what has happened with our trade policy in the last decade. In 1992, the year I was elected to Congress, we in this country had a \$38 billion trade deficit. Today, 12 years later, our trade deficit is \$618 billion. From \$38 billion, a dozen years later to \$618 billion. It is clear our trade policy simply is not working.

Opponents to CAFTA know that simply it is an extension of the North