

Adult stem cells tend not to form tumors. And there is absolutely no harm done to the donor when we harvest adult stem cells. Now, what are the disadvantages? Let us be fair. There are some. There is a limited quantity of them. They can sometimes be difficult to obtain in large numbers.

They may not live as long as embryonic stem cells in a culture. And they may be a little bit less flexible, with the exception again of bone marrow and umbilical cord ones.

Now, why are adult stem cells preferable to embryonic stem cells? Adult stem cells are a natural solution. They naturally exist in our bodies, and they provide a natural repair mechanism for many tissues of our bodies. They belong in a microenvironment of an adult body, while embryonic stem cells belong in the microenvironment of the early embryo, not in an adult body where they tend to cause tumors and immune system reactions.

Most importantly, adult stem cells have already been successfully used in human therapies for many years. And let me just say, some of the therapies that adult stem cells have been used for, they have treated brain cancer. Embryonic stem cells have not.

Adult stem cells have treated breast cancer, they have treated ovarian cancer, adult stem cells have treated testicular cancer. Embryonic stem cells have not.

Adult stem cells have treated leukemia, Crone's disease, anemia, stroke, Parkinson's disease. Embryonic stem cells have not been able to treat any of these diseases, not any of them.

It is really important that people understand the difference in the two types of cells. I support the President's position on what to do with embryonic stem cells. I think the President has come up with a very carefully thought-out position on this issue. And this is where we need to stay.

The people who are pushing the use of embryonic stem cells say they want something to salvage from the cryo stage because they will be destroyed or kept in limbo. That does not have to happen. Once we begin to use embryonic stem cells for treatment, we are crossing the Rubicon in terms of ethical issues. We cross an ethical barrier when we do that because we are destroying one life for another.

Those embryos are human beings and should not be treated as research subjects. We would never kill to harvest body parts because of the principle of human dignity.

We do not even do this with our most heinous criminals. We do not treat them as things. We treat them with dignity until the time that they die.

We have a terrible situation with people promoting the destruction of embryos for stem cell research. And I thought it would be interesting tonight to remind us of what the Declaration of Independence says. This is the Declaration of Independence that unfortunately too few young people read or understand in our society anymore.

And I will just read the beginning of it: "When in the course of human events it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the Earth the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation."

And this is the part of the Declaration that if anybody knows the Declaration of Independence at all, this is the part that they know: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal. That they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the government.

It is extremely important that we not lose sight of what founded this country, and the basic principle of life which is enunciated in the Declaration of Independence. We have to come down to understanding what is a human being. Scientists will say that an embryo is a human being. It is internally self-directed. And I want to say some more about that.

Because what happens with an embryo is nobody has to do anything to it from the outside. It is a human being at the embryonic stage. And it internally self-directs itself to grow and to develop into a person that then is born after the cells divide and divide and divide.

We are not talking about a religious issue only. For some people this is a fundamental religious issue, and it should be. But it is also a scientific issue. All human beings have profound human dignity. And, again, never, never in our society have we stooped so low as to sacrifice some human beings for others.

There is not a single therapeutic trial going on in the United States right now using embryonic cells, no clinical trial. There are lots and lots and lots of trials going on using adult cells.

There is private money going into this research, but the President has said we will not use government money; we will not tax the people of this country, many of whom are so opposed to this issue to do something which they find so abhorrent. Now, there is money going into research. Private money. Where is that money going?

It is going into the research for adult cells. That should tell us a lot. People think that that is where the payoff is going to be. People do not invest their money in things that they do not think is going to pay off.

And it is very, very important that we not be persuaded to use government

money, our money, taxpayers' money to go into something that not only holds very, very little promise for any kind of results, but is so abhorrent again to so many of our people.

Now, I want to share with you some success stories about adult stem cell research. Laura Dominguez had a spinal cord injury. As a result of a car accident in 2001, she broke her neck and was paralyzed from the chest down. She was treated with a mix of adult stem cells and other cells obtained from olfactory tissues inside her own nose.

The cells were transplanted across the injury site and her damaged spinal cord; and several months after the surgery, she was able to move her foot. She now walks with braces. Her remarkable progress is continuing, and several other spinal cord injury patients like her are also showing benefits from the transplant surgery.

Patrizia Durante was diagnosed with acute leukemia 6 months into her pregnancy. Her daughter, Victoria Angel, was born healthy; but Durante was given only 6 months to live. The stem cells from the blood of her daughter's umbilical cord were used for a transplant. Several years later, Durante is in full remission.

Durante told reporters she saved her mommy. She is a little miracle. That is why we named her Victoria Angel. She is my little angel.

There are many, many examples of people who have been treated and treated extremely well with adult stem cells. Again, I want to say that we are stepping into dangerously uncharted territory when we begin the practice, or if we begin the practice of destroying one life to try to help another life.

It is an ethical Rubicon that we should not be crossing. And, again, I know that many people are doing this because they are concerned. They have members of their family who are diabetic, they have members of their family who have Parkinson's disease, or they know people who have diseases and they want to do something to help them.

I urge them to study this issue very, very carefully and make sure that they understand the differences between what is happening with adult stem cell research and embryonic stem cell research. And I feel certain that those people will make the right decision, and they will not vote to use money to destroy human embryos and go in that direction when we do not have to, because we have the means to save lives and improve the quality of life with adult stem cells.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. HARMAN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today after 7:30 p.m. and the balance of the week on account of official travel.

Mr. LUCAS (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today after 4:00 p.m. and

the balance of the week on account of family commitments.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. MCCARTHY, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. ALLEN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.
(The following Members (at the request of Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GUTKNECHT, for 5 minutes, May 25.
Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, May 19.
Mr. OSBORNE, for 5 minutes, May 19.
Mr. GINGREY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. PRICE of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, May 19, 23, 24, and 25.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. KING of Iowa, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 19, 2005, at 9:00 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1985. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Pinene Polymers; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [OPP-2005-0110; FRL-7710-3] received May 11, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1986. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Red Cabbage Color; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [OPP-2004-0361; FRL-7711-7] received May 11, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1987. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Dimethyl Ether; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [OPP-2005-0109; FRL-7711-4] received May 11, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1988. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—*Alternaria destruens* Strain 059; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [OPP-2005-048; FRL-7708-3] received May 16, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1989. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Fludioxonil; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-2005-0095; FRL-7711-9] received May 16, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1990. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Dimethenamid; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-2005-0118; FRL-7713-4] received May 6, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1991. A letter from the Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of Vice Admiral Henry G. Ulrich III, United States Navy, to wear the insignia of the grade of admiral in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1992. A letter from the Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of Major General Robert D. Bishop, United States Navy, to wear the insignia of the grade of lieutenant general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1993. A letter from the Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of Major General Christopher A. Kelly, United States Navy, to wear the insignia of the grade of lieutenant general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1994. A letter from the Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of Rear Admiral John D. Stufflebeem, United States Navy, to wear the insignia of the grade of vice admiral in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1995. A letter from the Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of Lieutenant General William R. Looney, United States Navy, to wear the insignia of the grade of general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1996. A letter from the Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of Major General Michael A. Hamel, United States Navy, to wear the insignia of the grade of lieutenant general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1997. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental

Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Commonwealth of Virginia; Emission Standards for Solvent Cleaning Operations Using Non-Halogenated Solvents [R03-OAR-2005-VA-0006; FRL-7913-5] received May 16, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1998. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans for Kentucky: Inspection and Maintenance Program Removal for Jefferson County, Kentucky; Source-Specific Nitrogen Oxides Emission Rate for Kosmos Cement Kiln [R04-OAR-2004-KY-0002-20051; FRL-7914-5] received May 16, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1999. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Imperial County Air Pollution Control District and San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District [CA-309-0475a; FRL-7901-9] received May 16, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2000. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Iron and Steel Foundries [OAR-2002-0034; FRL-7911-8] received May 11, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2001. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Asphalt Processing and Asphalt Roofing Manufacturing [OAR-2002-0035; FRL-7911-6] (RIN: 2060-AM10) received May 11, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2002. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Miscellaneous Coating Manufacturing [OAR-2003-0178; FRL-7911-1] (RIN: 2060-AM72) received May 11, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2003. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Emission Standards for Pharmaceuticals Production [OAR-2004-0023; FRL-7911-3] (RIN: 2060-AM52) received May 11, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2004. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; VOC Emissions Standards for AIM Coatings [VA151-5085; FRL-7910-1] received May 6, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2005. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; State of Washington; Spokane Carbon Monoxide Attainment Plan [WA-01-003; FRL-7906-3] received May 6, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.