

Mr. Speaker, I stand today to recognize the massacres in Sumgait, Azerbaijan, and the continued Turkish and Azeri aggression against the Armenian people.

This massacre left dozens of Armenians dead, a majority of whom were set on fire alive after being beaten and tortured. Hundreds of innocent people received injuries of different severity and became physically impaired. Women, among them minors, were abused. More than 200 apartments were robbed, dozens of cars were destroyed and burned, dozens of art and crafts studios, shops and kiosks were demolished, and thousands of people became refugees.

Mr. Speaker, these crimes were never adequately prosecuted by the Government of Azerbaijan, and most of its organizers and executors were simply set free. Despite the attempt by the Government of Azerbaijan to cover up these crimes, enough brave witnesses came forward to give an accurate account of the offenses.

The Sumgait massacres are just another in a long line of Azerbaijan's aggressions against the Armenian people. The events in Sumgait were preceded by a wave of Anti-Armenian rallies that shook the city in February 1988. Almost the entire territory of the city, with a population of 250,000, became an arena for mass violence against its Armenian population.

The attacks also marked the beginning of the violent Armenian-Azerbaijani conflict, which claimed nearly 30,000 lives and left over 1 million refugees. The continued hostilities in Azerbaijan and the military aggression against the Armenians of Nagorno Karabakh in 1992 through 1994 led to the disappearance of a 450,000-strong Armenian community in Azerbaijan within a span of just a few years.

Mr. Speaker, today many Armenians marked the anniversary of the Sumgait massacre by organizing a march here in Washington from the embassy of Turkey to the embassy of Azerbaijan in order to highlight the continued Turkish and Azeri aggression toward the Armenian people.

The aggression I speak of, however, is still happening in a number of ways even today. There continues to be an organized effort to destroy historically sacred Armenian sites by the Government of Azerbaijan. Recently, there has been a documented video, evidencing the systematic destruction of a more than 1,000-year-old cemetery and historic carved stone crosses in the southern Nakhichevan region of Djulfa.

There are also continued attempts by Turkey and Azerbaijan to strangle Armenia's economy and its people's ability to survive through economic aggressions. The over 10-year blockade of Armenia by Turkey and Azerbaijan cuts off a valuable trade route through the country and further isolates Armenia. These blockades have been denounced by the United States, the United Nations and the European

Union, but they still exist as a way to starve the Armenian economy. The United States should do more to encourage the Turkish and Azerbaijani Governments to stop their illegal blockade of Armenia.

Mr. Speaker, today, as the protesters walk the cold route from the Turkish embassy to the Azerbaijani embassy, the message should be heard loud and clear. It is time for the United States to do all that it can and to flex its geopolitical muscle in order to send a message that ethnically charged genocides, illegal blockades of sovereign nations and the constant harassment of the Armenian people will not be tolerated.

This anniversary reminds us yet again of the historical injustice the Armenian people have faced, unfortunately, throughout their history.

THE TRANSEA ACT

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, the Bush administration recently approved a deal, as we all know, that allowed the operation of six U.S. ports to be taken over by Dubai Ports World, a state-owned company controlled by the Government of the United Arab Emirates, a \$6.8 billion contract.

The administration's handling of this deal has drawn criticism from Republicans and Democrats alike, and rightly so.

The 9/11 Commission's final report warns of the United Arab Emirates' record of support for terrorism and its links to September 11, both strategic and financial.

The Congressional Research Service noted the UAE was named as a point of shipment for illegal nuclear components sold by Pakistan.

The U.S. Coast Guard told the administration, referring to the United Arab Emirates-controlled ports, that, "There are many intelligence gaps, concerning the potential for DPW or PNO assets to support terrorist operations."

These and other more serious concerns may have been overlooked, as the administration rushed its review of this deal, but what this instance really highlights is a much broader and longer-term concern, the lack of a systematic process for the review of homeland security issues associated with America's international trade policy.

In a post-9/11 world, trade agreements are no longer just vehicles for economic development. Trade agreements, to be sure, lower tariffs in open markets, but they also can lower our defenses as they open our ports and open our infrastructure and open our transportation and supply lines.

In the post-9/11 world, America's trade policies and America's homeland security policies cannot exist separate from each other and in isolation. The risk is simply too great.

For example, the United States Trade Representative right now is currently negotiating a trade deal with the United Arab Emirates. That trade deal would already have been in effect if it had been negotiated, passed by the Senate, passed by the House and signed by the President. It would likely have been declared illegal and unfair trade practice for us to cancel that \$6.8 billion deal.

The administration has it exactly backwards. Security needs to go in these trade agreements before they are signed, not pass a trade agreement and then hope for the best to protect the homeland.

Other trade pacts negotiated by the Bush administration have given foreign governments, and even foreign companies, the right to sue the U.S. for government actions that cost the company money. There is no reason to believe that such suits could not be filed in some cases to block homeland security policies. Those suits would be heard by an international tribunal meaning that the U.S. would no longer have independent control over our own national security decisions.

Before we implement the UAE agreement, the one that the U.S.T.R. is negotiating today or any other free trade agreement, we should have a full understanding of homeland security consequences.

That is why I introduced today the Trade-Related America National Security Enhancement and Accountability Act, the TRANSEA bill. My bill would do several things: require a systematic homeland security review of trade agreements, with sign-off from the U.S. Trade Representative, the Homeland Security Department and other responsible agencies, and with reporting to Congress.

Second, it would require that all future agreements include a national security waiver, allowing the President to suspend an agreement or any provision of an agreement if the President determines that the agreement creates a homeland security vulnerability.

Third, it would create an independent trade security commission to watchdog trade policy from a homeland security perspective and report to Congress on potential threats.

Last, it would allow Congress to force action if the administration fails to respond to a homeland security warning from the commission.

It is absurd to require that our constituents remove their shoes at the airport, but not require that multibillion dollar trade agreements undergo systematic homeland security review.

The TRANSEA Act is an important step toward a policy that reflects the realities of a post-9/11 world. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

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

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

EMBRYONIC STEM CELL RESEARCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, very shortly now the juvenile diabetes people will be coming through the Congress. They do this every year, I believe.

I look forward to this visit with really mixed emotions. These children come in with this disease that has and will change their lives. Many of them are so brittle that they have to have a pump embedded under their skin that pumps insulin, because the sugar may go violently up or down with potentially disastrous effects on the person. Many times a day they may have to get a droplet of blood to determine the sugar level.

They will appeal to us, as they have every year for the past 5 years, please vote for Federal funds for embryonic stem cell research because they believe, like the loved ones of many other types of patients, that there could truly be miracle cures from embryonic stem cells. They will tell us that there are several hundred thousand embryos out there that are frozen in fertility clinics.

I have a daughter-in-law who is going through that process now. They harvest eggs. They fertilize the eggs. First, they have to give a hormone treatment to the prospective mother so that there will be the production of more than just the one egg that is produced normally per month. They will harvest a number of eggs, 8, 10, 12 eggs. Then they will fertilize those eggs, and they will watch their growth in the laboratory, and they will choose two or three of what look like the strongest fertilized eggs, and then they will implant those in the prospective mother.

The remaining eggs are frozen. It costs money to keep them there. The family may pay for that process because these little embryos that are implanted may not take, and they may need to do it again, and frozen, they could last quite a while, and they may want to have another child. So they will pay to keep them frozen for a while; but by and by, time and changes in the family, they will see no further need to keep them frozen. When they cease doing that, then the laboratory must either dispose of the embryos or bear the expense of keeping them frozen.

So each year a number of these embryos are discarded, and there has been an appeal, which has been bought into by some of my very good friends in the Congress, that from an ethical perspective, why should we not get some med-

ical use from these embryos that are going to be discarded anyhow.

That is a tough position to put pro-life people in, and the reason that most, but not all, pro-life advocates are opposed to this is because they view this as the beginning of a slippery slope. Today, you are permitting the use of surplus embryos that are going to be discarded anyhow; tomorrow, you might be producing embryos. They may be stronger, younger. You may be producing embryos just so you can discard them so you could use them for medical research.

I remembered the juvenile diabetes groups that come through, the children and their parents when, in 2000, I went to the National Institutes of Health when they had a briefing for Members of Congress and staff on embryonic stem cell research, the potentials and the challenge. There were a number of staff there. I think that I was the only Member of Congress who was there.

I went there from a somewhat unusual background, a different background than the average Member of Congress, because in a former life, I went to school and got a doctorate in human physiology. I got it not in a medical school but at an arts and sciences campus, and so we had to take a great variety of courses.

□ 2045

Things like limnology and ichthyology and cytology and protozoology and advanced genetics. And one of the courses I took was advanced embryology. And in that course I had an opportunity to study and learn something about the process which is so familiar to anybody who has studied biology in life, that is, the development of the embryo and how this process goes.

I recognized that occasionally in humans in the early embryo, sometimes at the two-cell stage and sometimes later, and you can tell by how the babies present whether they share an amnion or simply share the chorion; how they present at birth you can tell at roughly what time in the development of the embryo did it split. And each of those halves of the original embryo, either one cell if it was a two-cell stage, or multiple cells if it was further along in the development before it split, each half produces what appears to be a perfectly normal baby. We call them identical twins. And there are tens of thousands of them out there and a great deal of scientific interest is in these twins.

And a lot of research has been done, because when you are looking at two genetically identical people, you have an opportunity to make some studies and observations that you would have to use a great many more subjects to make using the usual genetic different subjects.

And so recognizing that you could take half of the cells away from the original embryo and each half produced a perfectly normal baby, I rationalized,

gee, it ought to be possible to take a cell from the early embryo and it would not even know it. And that is because all the cells in the early embryo are what we call totipotent or at least pluripotent. Totipotent means they can produce another embryo if you take the cell out, and pluripotent means they can produce all of the cell types that make up the body. By the time they are pluripotent, they have lost the ability to coordinate all of the different kind of cells into an integrated individual, so they could not produce an embryo.

I asked the researchers at NIH, should it not be possible to take a cell from an early embryo without killing the embryo, probably without hurting the embryo, since in every set of identical twins half of the cells have been taken away from the embryo.

And by the way, Mr. Speaker, one of those is a clone. I guess you can decide which one of those identical twins you would identify as the clone, but clearly one of them is a clone, and both of them develop into what appears to be, by observations over hundreds of years and more recently many years of intensive physiological and medical observation, what appear to be perfectly normal human beings.

And so I asked the researcher at NIH, shouldn't it be possible to take a cell from an early embryo without killing the embryo, probably without hurting it? And they said, yes, they thought that should be possible. So a few days after that I happened to be at an event when the President was there, and I knew that he was laboring with a decision, a very difficult decision, of whether he was going to permit Federal dollars to be used in embryonic stem cell research when presently at that time the only source of embryonic stem cells resulted from the destruction of an embryo.

So I told the President about the meeting at NIH and about my discussion with the researchers there, and a few days later I got a call from Karl Rove. The President had remembered that conversation and turned the follow-up over to Karl Rove, and Mr. Rove told me that he had gone to NIH and had spoken with the investigators there, and they had told him that that was not possible. I said, Karl, either they are funning you or they misunderstood your question, because these are the same people that can go into an individual cell and take out the nucleus and put another nucleus in that cell. And they are telling you they cannot take a cell or two out of a big embryo?

So he went back and asked them again and came back and called me a second time and said, Roscoe, they tell me that they cannot do that. I wondered at the time what had happened. And a couple of years later, when the researchers at NIH were in my office, they somewhat sheepishly admitted that they had permitted Mr. Rove to believe something that wasn't quite true. Because what they had told him