

□ 1015

COMBATING FRAUDULENT CREDIT CARD ABUSE

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, what do Ozzy Osbourne concert tickets, strip clubs, Las Vegas casinos, and expensive jewelry have in common?

If you think it sounds like a bachelor party itinerary, you will be surprised to learn it actually is a sampling of purchases made and places visited by Federal employees while using their government-issued credit cards.

What began as an efficient method for tracking and reimbursing legitimate expenses has morphed into an unmonitored system that can lend itself to abuse and fraud. For these reasons, Senator GRASSLEY and I have reintroduced the Government Credit Card Prevention Act. This bill provides for necessary oversight, including credit checks and periodic audits.

American taxpayers will not stand for this continued abuse and lack of oversight. Enactment of this legislation is crucial to promote fiscal responsibility.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September 11.

CONGRATULATIONS TO J.F. ALLEN COMPANY

(Mrs. CAPITO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, on March 21 of this year, a West Virginia leader in work site safety, J.F. Allen Company, marked a milestone of 1 million safe hours of work. I rise today to honor the company and join its employees in celebrating this outstanding accomplishment.

Established as a small family business, J.F. Allen Company has grown into one of the largest heavy highway construction firms in our State. The company's contributions can be seen in all corners of my district, including Stonewall Jackson Dam and Interstates 79 and 81.

J.F. Allen's contributions to the State are critical to our infrastructure development and maintenance. However, it is their commitment to employee safety that is the most important contribution to West Virginia. Thanks in large part to an award-winning safety program, employees are safe at work, logging 1 million safe hours since 1994.

Mr. Speaker, small businesses are the heart of our economy, especially in rural States like West Virginia. J.F. Allen Company's record of worker safety and commercial achievement is a model for all companies and represents the very best of West Virginia's workers and businesses.

STEM CELL RESEARCH ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2007

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 464 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 464

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (S. 5) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for human embryonic stem cell research. All points of order against the bill and against its consideration are waived except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI. The bill shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and (2) one motion to commit.

SEC. 2. During consideration of S. 5 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McDERMOTT). The gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI) is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution and to insert extraneous materials into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 464 provides for consideration of S. 5, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act of 2007. The closed rule provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The rule waives all points of order against the bill and against its consideration except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI. The rule also provides one motion to commit.

Mr. Speaker, today's debate on stem cell research should be about the hope of science. It should be about how our society has always valued ethical medical research.

Many Americans awoke this morning to a news story about a potential new stem cell research technique using skin cells from mice. It was on the front page of many newspapers precisely because our society values hope and scientific advancement when done in an ethical manner.

The bill made in order under this rule maintains that tradition. With the House's approval, expanded Federal embryonic stem cell research again will be one signature away from becoming law.

Mr. Speaker, we already know that embryonic stem cell research has a potential to cure many debilitating conditions like diabetes, Parkinson's disease, Alzheimer's, spinal cord damage, and maybe even bone marrow failure. These ailments affect the young and the old, the rich and the poor.

Families from all walks of life have had firsthand experiences with these tragedies. Sad but true, disease is one of life's great equalizers. Research and medical ingenuity are our society's tools to fight these diseases.

This shared experience, the hope that stem cell research brings, may be one reason why it enjoys such bipartisan support. Polls indicate that three out of every five Americans support stem cell research, including 54 percent of Republicans.

But there are many other reasons to endorse expanded Federal stem cell research. Earlier this year, Congress and the world heard support from an unexpected source. In testimony before Congress on March 19, the Director of the NIH made a high-profile break with the administration on shortsighted stem cell policy. He said: "It is clear today that American science would be better served and the Nation would be better served if we let our scientists have access to more cell lines that they can study."

The United States has always led the effort to push the frontiers of medical research. But as the NIH Director's testimony indicates, Mr. Speaker, on this issue the United States is falling behind for no good scientific or moral reason.

His testimony is in line with the consensus within the wider scientific community as well. The American Association for the Advancement of Science, the Cancer Research and Prevention Foundation, the UC Davis Medical Center in my hometown of Sacramento, the University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center at Dallas in my colleague's district, the Lance Armstrong Foundation, all of these and hundreds of others support ethical embryonic stem cell research.

Mr. Speaker, it is abundantly clear that we must update our national stem cell research policy. A bipartisan majority in Congress has tried several times. Last year, both Chambers voted by wide bipartisan margins to expand ethical Federal stem cell research. Unfortunately, the President blocked that progress, that hope, that good science. But his veto only delays the issue temporarily because support for this responsible research continues to grow.

Earlier this year, the new Democratic majority acted swiftly to reconsider the issue. The bill before us is a result of that bipartisan, bicameral leadership; and it passed by a greater margin than in the last Congress.

We should act now to forward that proposal on to the President. We should give him another chance to do what is right by signing this bill into law.

Mr. Speaker, there is little disagreement about the science of stem cell research or what ethical rules should govern it, so let's stop delaying a commonsense proposal. I urge all Members to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this closed rule and to this seriously flawed underlying legislation. While the process involved with bringing bills to this floor is very slightly improved over this past January when the Democratic leadership bypassed long-standing bipartisan regular order and used their rules package to create a closed process that skipped even bringing their flawed stem cell bill to the Rules Committee for its consideration, it is still overwhelmingly flawed and directly contradicts widely reported Democrat campaign promises to run the most open and ethical Congress in history.

Yesterday, the Rules Committee met and the majority Democrats reported out two completely closed rules, one which will completely lock down this important debate today regarding the Federal funding of stem cell research upon which a great deal of honest and heartfelt moral and scientific disagreement exists on both sides of the aisle.

In this exclusive and rushed process, it feels very familiar for the Members. If it does, it should. Because, back in January, the Democrat leadership forced a similar hastily written and politically motivated stem cell bill through the House without any input from the Members. Their purpose then was the same as it is today: to attempt to score some political points at the expense of sound science, openness, and transparency, not to mention feedback from its Members.

Because they knew that their crass political move would never pass the Senate, today we are forced again to take up yet another flawed stem cell bill for political purposes under yet another completely closed rule that provides no Member of this body with the opportunity to amend or improve it.

Worst of all, rather than taking this second chance to work in a bipartisan fashion to create a bill that balances cutting-edge medical research with the serious ethical implications created by stem cell research, this rule simply advances the Democrats' cynical agenda to send a flawed bill to the President for his veto, despite the legislation not even achieving a veto-proof majority in the Senate.

Unfortunately, judging by their performance on recent supplemental funding measures for our troops, it seems like the Democrats need to be vetoed

once or twice before they realize that they simply cannot pander to their liberal blogs. They actually need to work together to reach across the aisle to deliver workable bills that are in the interest of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, not only is this a bad way to handle this process, I think it is an embarrassment to the institution that the Democrat leadership would fail to work openly with the over 400 duly elected Members of this legislative body to find common ground that balances the multiple grave concerns surrounding this legislation.

This legislation forces taxpayers to fund research requiring the destruction of human embryos rather than seeking a middle ground on which researchers can be provided with the embryonic stem cells that they need to advance science while not violating the sanctity of life.

This legislation fails to specify whether these embryonic stem cells that will now be eligible for Federal funding can be taken from embryos that still retain the potential for implantation or if they would be taken from embryos that no longer have the potential for further cellular division.

This lack of clarity is not a function of a lack of ideas or debate on the matter. A compromise measure, introduced in the Senate by Senators ISAKSON and COLEMAN, already exists which provides for research only on those embryos which no longer have the potential for cellular division.

Here in the House my colleagues, including my friend from Georgia, Dr. GINGREY, also offered a thoughtful amendment that was rejected by the Democrat Rules Committee which would have provided for the Federal funding of pluripotent stem cells which can specialize in any bodily tissue but cannot develop into a human being.

□ 1030

And despite the near-certain protests to the contrary that will be made by some Members of this body, this legislation also fails to contain language to prohibit or even propose ethical regulations for cloning or egg farming.

Finally, rather than allowing science to progress based on merit, this legislation picks winners and losers in the research community by choosing which research methods would be funded. It diverts research funds from very promising areas, such as adult stem cells and cord blood, despite the fact that adult stem cells have already been proven to work over and over.

But don't take my word for it. James Thompson, the first scientist to derive stem cells from a human embryo, was quoted in *The Wall Street Journal* saying, "I am not entirely convinced that embryonic stem cells will, in my lifetime and possibly anybody's lifetime for that matter, be holding quite the promise that we desperately hope they will."

Mr. Speaker, this debate has been so politicized that the American public

can no longer even hear above the political fray about the miraculous and leading-edge technologies and therapies being derived today from adult stem cells, amniotic fluid and human umbilical cords, all without the moral and ethical controversies created by this bill.

Treatments for injuries and chronic illnesses as diverse as spinal cord and heart tissue regeneration, bone marrow and vision therapies and diabetic management are all emerging as we speak, and this Congress should not be in the business of politically allocating scarce resources away from these technologies and methods as researchers continue to perform scientific miracles, such as creating embryonic-like stem cells without using eggs or destroying embryos, like the scientists at the Whitehead Institute for Biomedical Research in Cambridge, Massachusetts, have already accomplished in laboratory tests.

The point, Mr. Speaker, is that the process provided for under this rule does not allow for debate on the central issue: Does a middle ground exist that can provide scientists with the stem cells that they need to continue their cutting-edge research while at the same time respecting the sanctity of life?

Unfortunately, once again, the graveyard of good ideas in the House, the Democrat Rules Committee, has provided this body with a rule that allows none of this debate. Instead, Members of this body are being asked to vote up or down on a very blunt measure that fails to recognize the vast complexity of this issue.

This is no way to run the people's House, Mr. Speaker, and it is certainly no way to run a self-proclaimed most open and ethical Congress in history. I urge all of my colleagues to defeat this rule and the underlying legislation so that the House can have a real and meaningful debate on this issue and not allow something as important as the fate of stem cell research to be determined by bumper-sticker politics. This House does deserve better and the American people deserve better.

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

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from California (Ms. MATSUI) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this ground-breaking legislation, S. 5, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act of 2007, and I want to commend the bipartisan leadership of Senator REID and Senator HARKIN and Senator ORRIN HATCH for their hard work in crafting and passing this legislation. And I also want to thank the bipartisan leadership of Congresswoman DIANA DEGETTE and Congressman MIKE CASTLE for their tireless work on stem cell research funding.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats have fought long and hard in the name of science

and innovation. Here in the House of Representatives on January 11 of this year, as part of the 100 hours legislation led by Speaker PELOSI, we saw the unlocked potential held in stem cell research. We saw the potential to cure the diseases that affect 100 million Americans, debilitating diseases such as Parkinson's, diabetes, Alzheimer's, Lou Gehrig's, multiple sclerosis and cancer, and I could go and on and on and on.

In my district of Massachusetts, my constituents see the value of progress and want to invest in the life sciences. As part of the life science initiative by the State, a stem cell bank will be created at the University of Massachusetts Medical Center in Worcester. It will be part of the largest repository of stem cell lines in the world.

Mr. Speaker, embryonic stem cell research has the support of over 500 organizations, including the American Medical Association, AARP, the Association of American Medical Colleges, American Diabetes Association and Paralyzed Veterans of America, and I could go on. I believe we owe the American people the promise of science and medicine.

The legislation before us reflects the best science in the world. The legislation before us holds out the hope for a better life for millions of people all throughout the world.

It is time that President Bush stop being an obstructionist on this issue. It is time that he gets out of the way and listens to the will of the American people.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), my colleague, says that this is about politics. It is not about politics. This has nothing to do with politics, and it is sad that so many people who oppose this want to politicize this issue. It isn't about politics.

It is about life and death. It is about improving the quality of life through the best science that is available to us.

So it is time for this Congress to at long last do the right thing. We have debated this issue over and over and over and over and over. It is time for this Congress to do the right thing, to listen to the will of the American people, to listen to the best science and finally pass this bill.

GOVERNOR PATRICK ANNOUNCES MASSACHUSETTS'S NEW LIFE SCIENCE INITIATIVE

BOSTON.—Tuesday, May 8—Governor Deval Patrick today announced his plan to make Massachusetts the global leader in life sciences, unveiling for the first time ever a comprehensive, collaborative Massachusetts Life Science Strategy.

The plan, outlined during a speech at the BIO 2007 convention, includes a 10 year, \$1 billion investment package that will both enhance the state's already nationally recognized assets in the fields of medicine and science and fill gaps in federal funding to ensure the state's ability to support life science progress from the idea stage through the production stage. The Patrick Administration's strategy brings together industry, academic research hospitals, and public and private colleges and universities to coordinate these efforts, spur new research,

strengthen investments, create new jobs and produce new therapies for a better quality of life.

"There is no place in the world with as much talent in life sciences and biotech as here in Massachusetts," said Governor Patrick. "Now is the time for us to invest in that talent and bring together the resources of our unparalleled research universities, teaching hospitals, and industry to work towards a common goal—to grow ideas into products to create cures and jobs."

Key to the Governor's Life Science Initiative is new legislation that will strengthen the Massachusetts Life Science Center and charge it with the execution of a life science mission focused on science and economic development, strategic investments at critical stages of the development cycle, and collaboration with the private sector to create innovation infrastructure critical to both researchers and companies. The Governor also announced his commitment to making targeted investments in companies that encourage life science economic development in the Commonwealth.

"I commend the Governor for reaching out to all sectors of our life science cluster in order to craft a stem cell/life science package that recognizes the unique institutional assets and intellectual firepower in our region," said Steven Hyman, Professor of Neurobiology at Harvard Medical School and Chairman of the Massachusetts. "The Governor allocates state resources in effective ways to enhance our traditional strengths, buttress areas that need attention, and encourage powerful collaborations between our leading edge institutions."

Today's announcement at the BIO 2007 Convention highlighted the following:

A \$1 billion investment package that includes funds to:

Bridge the NIH funding gap—A competitive grant program during the current downturn in federal support to sustain key programs in the state. Our collective success during the 1998-2003 period when the NIH budget doubled from \$14 billion to \$28 billion only solidified Massachusetts' dominance in the area of biomedical research. However, the subsequent four years of flat funding since 2003 has caused a 13 percent loss of funding power by NIH and a 35 percent reduction in support for clinical trials. The Patrick administration will make surgical investments during the downturn to sustain key programs here in Massachusetts in order that our position is sustained to once again capture large percentages of new funding when it materializes.

Create the Massachusetts Stem Cell Bank—A first in the nation centralized repository of new stem cell lines available to all sectors, public and private, of research enterprise. Boston University, Brigham & Women's, Children's Hospital, Harvard University, Massachusetts General Hospital, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Partners HealthCare and the University of Massachusetts have already agreed to participate in the Bank when it is completed.

Establish Massachusetts Life Science Fellowship Grants—Grant packages for research institutions in Massachusetts to attract and retain the rising stars of life sciences research in the Commonwealth, and ensure Massachusetts is competitive with other states and nations.

Establish Massachusetts Life Science Innovation Centers—Centerbased research facilities that streamline technology transfer, development time and funding opportunity.

"As the president of the University of Massachusetts, the leading public academic research institution in the Commonwealth, I applaud Governor Patrick for making such a strong commitment to the life sciences, par-

ticularly stem cell research and RNAi-related research and development," said University of Massachusetts President Jack M. Wilson. "The announcement today is an important step in developing a world-class life sciences strategy for the Commonwealth that will foster scientific innovation, including unlocking the mysteries of debilitating diseases, and spur economic growth. The University of Massachusetts is proud to be able to play an important role in this strategy and I truly believe this proposal is far-reaching, comprehensive and of sufficient scope and scale to enable Massachusetts to continue and expand its national and global leadership in biotechnology and the life sciences."

"It is clear to me that scientific innovation and cutting-edge research help set Massachusetts apart in the eyes of the life sciences and greater scientific community. Today's announcement of this significant, new state funding is an important signal that the opportunities to do cutting-edge research in this state are expanding. I am proud that RNAi is already changing the scientific landscape, offering new tools in the effort to better human health; my colleagues at the UMass Medical School and I see great promise in our continued work with RNAi and RNAi Therapeutics. Support of this type from the government, academic institutions and society allows us to further advance science and to conduct important basic, clinical and translational research," Nobel Laureate Craig Mello, Ph.D. of the University of Massachusetts Medical School said.

"The future of life sciences is here in Massachusetts," Governor Patrick said. "We have the talent. We have the entrepreneurial spirit. Now let's seize the future."

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the ranking member of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to stand here as someone who is supportive of embryonic stem cell research. I have voted in support of this research in the past, and I plan to vote for it again today when this measure is brought up.

But I have to say that as I listened to my very good friend from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) speak on this issue, and I will say again to him that, as he knows, I am a supporter of stem cell research and I will be voting in support of this bill, I'm absolutely horrified by the remarks that were just made by my colleague from Massachusetts. Why? Because just yesterday he stood here during the debate on the Afghanistan Freedom Act rule and said there that we're now enjoying a new day in the House of Representatives, and yet, we today are considering this rule under a completely closed process, shutting out all Members, Democrats, Republicans alike, who might want to have an opportunity to make some kind of amendment or modification to this process.

Further, Mr. MCGOVERN went on to talk about the fact that there is a very important institution in his congressional district that will be the beneficiary of the funding that is provided

for this research, and that gets right to the point that I believe is a very important one for us to make.

Well, we continue, Mr. Speaker, to hear this argument that it's a new day in this Congress. I am very, very troubled over a number of issues and over the fact that nothing, nothing could be further from the case.

Now, we've heard both sides of the aisle talk about the need for earmark reform, and that's the reason that I just raised the issue of Mr. MCGOVERN's hospital to be a beneficiary of this bill. I'm wondering whether or not that's an earmark that we're considering.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm very proud of the fact that, in the 109th Congress, we passed major earmark reform legislation. It was earmark reform legislation that had enforceability and full accountability, and we heard Democrats say that they wanted to, quote/unquote, improve on the earmark reform that we proudly put into place in the 109th Congress.

The real tragedy here, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that we not only have seen no improvement on the issue of earmark reform, but what has happened? We have seen a retrograde step taken on the issue of accountability and enforceability.

And let me explain that to my colleagues and then proceed to say that Mr. SESSIONS will be moving to defeat the previous question, and if the House sees fit to defeat the previous question on this issue, Mr. Speaker, what we will do is we will offer an amendment, an amendment that will finally bring about the kind of enforceability that we passed in the 109th Congress but, through sleight of hand by the House Committee on Rules, has been denied every Democrat and every Republican in this institution.

And so let me make it very clear, as we complete this debate and go into a vote on the previous question, any Member of this institution who votes in favor of the previous question to end debate will be, in fact, denying an opportunity for us to have accountability, enforceability and transparency on this issue of earmark reform.

Now, what is it that we've seen reported to us on this earmark process that is going to be moving ahead in the days and weeks and months ahead? We've already seen abuse in the Intelligence authorization bill that we had, and I'm not going to get into the details of that. Everyone knows we had a major clash that took place here between our colleague from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA). We all know about that.

But what is on the horizon for us, Mr. Speaker? What's on the horizon is the fact that the very distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, has already announced, when it comes to the issue of earmarks, we're not going to be doing it in the appropri-

tions process. How is it that earmarks are going to be able to get into the bill? They're going to be air dropped into conference reports. Now, it's very difficult to imagine a more secretive process for earmarks than to have them air dropped into conference reports.

But now let's again look at what we did in the 109th Congress and what we're going to propose if Mr. SESSIONS is successful at defeating the previous question.

What is going to happen, Mr. Speaker, is we're simply going to say that there should be an opportunity for enforcement. Again, we had that enforcement provision in the earmark reform that we passed in the 109th Congress, but that has been completely denied. Mr. Speaker, no Democrat, no Republican can stand up, and if a list is not provided of those earmarks, raise a question about that. If the chairman has simply said, there are no earmarks, there is no opportunity today under the action that has been taken by this Democratic Congress, whether they have said they're for earmark reform and accountability and transparency, they, in fact, deny that.

And so all we're saying, Mr. Speaker, is let's give Democrats and Republicans an equal opportunity to do what it is that the American people have said should be done. We want to bring an end to wasteful spending and abuse of this so-called earmark process.

So there's going to be an opportunity. There's going to be an opportunity in just a few minutes for every single Member of this institution, Democrat and Republican alike, to decide whether or not we're going to build on the success that we had in the 109th Congress with accountability, enforceability and transparency on earmark reform, or will we, in fact, allow a secretive process which encourages abuse to proceed.

Now, I'm old enough, Mr. Speaker, to have served here when Ronald Reagan was President of the United States. In his negotiations with the Soviet Union, he used a Russian expression. "Doveryai, no proveryai," was the Russian expression that he used. And what did that translate to? "Trust, but verify." And that's exactly what this debate comes down to, Mr. Speaker: Trust, but verify, because I hear Democrats and Republicans alike say that we need to have full accountability and we need to bring an end to abuse of the earmark process. But we need to have a process of verification. We need to have a process that will allow us to ferret out the kind of abuse that we've already seen in the 110th Congress to this earmark process.

□ 1045

Again, I am going to encourage a "no" vote on the previous question. Mr. SESSIONS will be encouraging that at the end. When, because I am an eternal optimist, like Ronald Reagan, when we defeat the previous question, all we

will be doing is saying that we should come back to the kind of accountability, transparency, and enforceability of the earmark reform to which everyone seems to be so strongly committed.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I want to remind everybody today that we are talking about embryonic stem cell research.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ARCURI), a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. ARCURI. I thank my colleague and good friend, the gentlelady from California, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in very strong support of this rule and the underlying bill, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act.

I have listened to stories from around my upstate New York district from families affected by life-threatening and debilitating illnesses: children with childhood diabetes, men and women with spinal cord injuries, lupus, Alzheimer's and Parkinson's. Every day, these brave Americans fight the odds with the hope that stem cell research will one day give them a new lease on life.

The Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act will ensure that our Nation's scientists are able to work towards making that hope a reality. Most importantly, this bill creates an ethical framework, stronger than the President's current policy, which must be followed in conducting this lifesaving research. The bill only authorizes the use of stem cell lines generated from embryos that would otherwise be discarded by fertility clinics and requires written, informed consent from the donating women.

My constituents support this ethically responsible lifesaving research, and I stand with them today to give hope to millions of people around the country.

Opponents say they believe life is sacred, and I agree. It is. So let us leave no stone unturned to give as many people the opportunity, the chance to live, people with lupus, with Alzheimer's, with Parkinson's, with diabetes. Let us pass this stem cell bill.

The message from the American people is clear. It is time for this administration to do the right thing and sign this critically important law.

My colleague talks about bumper sticker policies and pandering to liberal blogs. This is not about pandering to liberal blogs. This is about listening to the American people. It is time this administration listens to the American people and signs a stem cell research bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia, Dr. GINGREY, 5 minutes.

Mr. GINGREY. I thank my former colleague on the Rules Committee, Mr. SESSIONS, for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in very strong opposition to the rule and the

underlying legislations, S. 5, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act.

Once again, the Democratic majority brings to the floor a closed rule on a bill that Members of this body would love to have the opportunity to make better through the amendment process. This legislation has not been given a committee hearing or even vetted in a markup. Instead, the Democrats in the House have said that they know best, period, in the 110th Congress.

Over 45 percent of the bills have come up under our closed rule, and less than 2 percent have enjoyed what we call an open rule that allows for full and honest debate, whether it's debate from a Democrat or a Republican.

Now their legislation was sent over to the other body in January, where they changed it, they amended it. So why, I don't understand, why do the House Democrats insist on shutting their colleagues in the people's House out of the process? It's okay in the other body, but it's not okay here.

Well, this new majority has sent a clear message when it comes to valuing the input of their colleagues. They don't.

On bills that clear committees unanimously, bills where both parties rush to the floor to applaud the final legislative process, the Democrats allow amendments on those. Let them offer them and be debated. But on an issue where the American people hold deeply differing views, the Democrats shut out ideas and debate.

By once again debating this stem cell legislation under the same closed rule, the Democratic leadership is saying to the American people this issue is the same today as it was in January, as it was last summer in the 109th Congress, as it was, indeed, back in August of 2001.

However, the reality is that this issue has fundamentally changed. Science is moving faster than bureaucracy and, yes, even faster than politics. Scientific breakthrough after scientific breakthrough shows that there are other ways to achieve the hope, the hope of medical cures, the new therapeutic treatments without any collateral damage mandated by the legislation that we are debating today.

Science has, indeed, outrun politics, and the American people, they deserve a full and comprehensive debate on a morally contentious issue such as this.

That's the reason that I offered an amendment, my colleague referred to it earlier, to the Rules Committee yesterday that would have replaced this ethically divisive legislation with a bill introduced by Representative ROSCOE BARTLETT, the gentleman from Maryland, and myself. We call it the Alternative Pluripotent Stem Cell Therapy Enhancement Act.

This amendment would authorize the use of Federal funds to research alternative and ethical ways to extract embryonic life or pluripotent stem cells. My amendment would authorize the use of Federal funds to research alter-

native and, yes, ethical ways to extract these embryonic-like, or we call them pluripotent, stem cells; and that's what we should be debating on the floor of this esteemed body today, legislation that sidesteps the ethical questions of embryonic stem cell research altogether.

We don't have to go down this road that totally divides us. Some on the Republican side, some on the Democratic side, pro-life, pro-choice, if we can avoid that division, I think we ought to embrace the opportunity to do so.

That's why, reluctantly, I have to come and stand and oppose a rule. I have great respect for my colleagues on the majority side of the Rules Committee that I worked with for the last 2 years, but I think it's wrong to close a rule or a question of this importance.

So I do, I ask my colleagues, oppose the rule and oppose the underlying legislation. That's exactly what we need to do, because we can do this better, and we don't have to divide one another.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, before I yield, I just want to make a point that this bill sets stringent ethical guidelines for an expanded Federal embryonic stem cell research program, and it encourages new alternative sources of stem cell research, like what made the news today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio, a member of the Rules Committee, Ms. SUTTON.

Ms. SUTTON. I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership on this rule and on this very, very important issue and for the time to speak.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in favor of the rule and in favor of S. 5, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act.

As the elected representative of diverse constituencies, we face many challenges in this House. We face challenges that affect the lives, finances, work and health of all Americans. As we face these challenges, we are called to do everything in our power to create solutions and find relief for the problems that plague our constituents. We are called to fight. We are called to work creatively. We are called to open doors and explore new avenues. We do everything in our power to relieve suffering, to bring relief, to create opportunity and to enhance lives.

Today, I rise in favor of continuing that mission to do everything that we possibly can to relieve the suffering of the people of Ohio's 13th District and districts across the United States.

During my campaign, I had the good fortune to meet a business owner by the name of Fred Martin. For the past 33 years, Fred has lived with diabetes. Diabetes has no cure. Despite diligent care, a precise diet and insulin, shots that he takes over and over throughout the day, the best that Fred can hope for is that his disease not get any worse. He has worked meticulously over the past 33 years to manage his disease so that he could be there for his

children and attend to his business, but he wonders how his life could be different.

Fred endures seven insulin shots every day, two before breakfast, two before lunch, two before dinner and one before bed. He pricks his finger to check his insulin levels 8 to 10 times every day. He says that he's glad that he's still here. He's grateful for all that science has done for him that has allowed for him to be around to raise his children. But he adds, please, don't stop now.

When discussing the potential that stem cells hold, he says, "To deny our scientists the right to make the people in our society healthier and to help them lead better lives is really a crime! . . . I expected more of my government."

If we do not change our policies soon, we will continue to drive this cutting-edge research overseas. Just this week, newspapers report that British scientists are embarking on research which could deliver the world's first stem cell treatment for blindness. The 4 million pounds that were donated to the project came from an anonymous American philanthropist. This country cannot afford to be a hostile environment for scientific research and development.

Today, we have a chance to unlock a world of potential. Our researchers will no longer have to fight with one hand tied behind their back.

I believe that we have a duty to our constituents to do everything we can to make their lives better, to relieve their suffering and to use our government and its resources effectively and efficiently to heal, help and explore.

Fred Martin was right. Our constituents expect more. Today, they will get it.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

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

Mr. PENCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his strong and clarification remarks on this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this rule and rise to oppose the underlying bill as well.

I must tell you, as I listened to the gentlelady from Ohio bring her remarks to the floor, I want to say, there they go again. There they go again, telling the American people that this is a debate between science and ideology when, in fact, destructive embryonic stem cell research, despite my strong moral objections, is completely legal in the United States of America.

The debate today is not about whether embryonic stem cell research, research that destroys a human embryo for scientific research, should take place. This is just about who pays for it.

I can understand why Members of the majority want to focus on this false choice between science and ideology.

The language like America becoming a hostile environment for medical research is amusing me, because destructive embryonic stem cell research, and I say this with a heavy heart, is legal in all 50 States in America. It is simply that liberals in this country are not content to simply have research that destroys human embryos for unproven human science, but they want me to pay for it. They want tens of millions of Americans who, like I do, believe that life begins at conception to see their taxpayer dollars used to fund research that they find morally objectionable. That's really the issue.

The debate is not about whether we should do embryonic stem cell research, would that it was, would that we were here on the floor actually debating along the fault lines of science and morality. I am ready for that debate. Forty-eight years and nine months ago today, I was an embryo. I am ready to have the debate about the sanctity and the value of human life. But we are not having that debate today.

America since *Roe v. Wade* has moved past the issue that was framed so eloquently by the late President Ronald Reagan. He said, we cannot diminish the value of one category of one human life without diminishing the value of all human life.

□ 1100

But our Supreme Court made a decision decades ago that we would put choice above life. But I will stay in that moral debate. But, again, it's not what we're about today. And any one of my colleagues here on the floor and anyone listening in, let's at least be honest about what we're talking about. And that is, this debate is not about whether we should do embryonic stem cell research. And I know we've heard from wonderful scientists on our side of the aisle who've reminded us, inconvenient for the majority, that 100 percent of the scientific breakthroughs that have taken place in stem cell research have taken place in adult stem cell research. There's not been a single therapy developed from embryonic stem cell research, and there are scientific reasons why we can expect that there never will be, given the instability of nascent human life at that stage. But I'm not an expert in that area.

You know, I'm a guy; I come from south of Highway 40 in Indiana. I keep things real simple. This is just a debate about who pays for research that destroys human embryos. And I simply want to say again, this debate is not really about what an embryo is. This debate is about who we are as a Nation; whether or not Congress will, as they did before, send legislation to the President of the United States that will take the taxpayer dollars of millions of pro-life Americans and use it to fund research that they find morally objectionable. But I can count, Mr. Speaker. I expect this legislation will

pass again. But I thank God that we have a President in the White House who will, I have every confidence, veto this legislation just as he did before, and that we have a tenacious pro-life minority in this House that will defend the President's veto.

Let me say, again, I believe that life begins at conception. And I believe it's morally wrong to create human life to destroy it for scientific research. But that is not what this debate is about. This debate is not about whether we should do embryonic stem cell research; it's about who pays for it. And liberals in this Congress are not content simply to have embryonic stem cell research legal in all 50 States. They want pro-life Americans like me to get our wallets out and finance it, and I'm not having that, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the next speaker, let me just say that Mrs. Reagan was in favor of stem cell research, embryonic stem cell research. And we know that President Reagan had a very debilitating disease, and I feel that that's the reason why she has supported it.

So with that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCHWARTZ).

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act.

My own State, Pennsylvania, is in the forefront of science and medicine. Our hospitals, medical schools, biotechnology and pharmaceutical institutions are home to some of the best and brightest scientists who are working every day to provide new medicines and diagnostics. These scientists need access to all of the tools available to do their vitally important work.

The science is clear. Stem cell research offers hope for better treatments and possible cures for cancer, Parkinson's, Alzheimer's, diabetes, spinal cord injuries and so many other debilitating diseases and disorders that directly affect 100 million Americans and their families.

Yet President Bush continues to let politics, not science, not the health and well-being of American families, and not the will of the majority of Americans dictate his decision-making.

American families want cures, not politics. They want hope, not lost opportunities. That is why it is so important that we are, again, bringing this proposal to the floor of Congress.

Today, with bipartisan support, Congress will again seek to offer hope to millions of Americans battling disease and injury. Today, Congress will, once again, vote to maintain the United States' stance as a world leader in medical research and scientific advancement. And today, we will stand up to the President and, again, choose to advance scientific discovery in an ethical and responsible manner.

I urge my colleagues to support ethical scientific research and to support hope. We should vote "yes" on this

rule. We should vote "yes" on the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to inquire upon how much time is remaining on both sides, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 3½ minutes. The gentlewoman from California has 14.

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

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes 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, this is a very personal debate, and it is a serious one. But I would only ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to entertain the thought that we are, today, addressing the lives of Americans, and we can't fool around with life and death issues that impact on the lives of Americans. Millions of Americans today, a collective number of 110 million, are dealing with the diseases of diabetes, Alzheimer's, some with spinal cord injuries, and many others impacted by the inertia of this body. And so let me applaud my colleague, Congresswoman DEGETTE, because this legislation, as my colleagues realize, is imperative for it to move as S. 5, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act of 2007. We know that if this bill does not pass, it does not get to the President's desk, and lives of millions of Americans will be impacted. It is a simple bill. It says that "the stem cells were derived from human embryos that are donated from in vitro fertilization clinics for the purpose of fertility treatment and were in excess of the needs of individuals seeking such treatment. The embryos would never be implanted in a woman and would otherwise be discarded. Such individuals donate the embryos with written informed consent, and receive no financial aid or other inducements." These embryos otherwise would be discarded.

What is our challenge in America? To rise to our higher angels?

This rule is constructed to save lives. Our friends will have the privilege of a motion to recommit, but we have the responsibility of saving the lives of 110 million Americans, children, family members of yours, loved ones, husbands and wives and others. Some are our soldiers on the front lines of Iraq and Afghanistan. We can do no less today. Pass S. 5. Vote for the rule, and vote against the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 5, the "Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act of 2007," which the House passed in substantially similar form by a vote of 253-174 on January 11, 2007. The legislation passed the Senate by a nearly veto-proof majority of 63-34. The only difference between the version passed by the House and the Senate is that

the Senate version contains a provision directing the Secretary of HHS to conduct and support research on alternative human pluripotent stem cells.

Mr. Speaker, once again we find ourselves in a position to pass legislation that will provide our nation's scientists with the valuable opportunity to save lives. It is our duty as representatives of the people to help Americans who are suffering. The President should put away his veto pen and listen to the American people. They want him to sign this bill. Signing this bill will help bring about the new direction in leadership and responsiveness that American people voted for last November.

In 1998, the very first stem cells were isolated, leading to the immediate realization of the enormous possibilities this discovery presents. Suddenly treatments, even cures, seemed possible for devastating illnesses like Parkinson's disease, diabetes, Alzheimer's, Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis (ALS), cancer, and spinal cord injuries.

Despite restrictions on federal funding imposed by President Bush in 2001, the states of California, New Jersey, Connecticut, Illinois, and Maryland have provided funding for this important research. In 2005 and again last year, we learned that in spite of the President's continued opposition to stem cell research, support for it in Congress transcended party lines.

Unfortunately, the embryonic stem cells currently permitted by law for research are not sufficient for scientists' needs. According to the National Institute of Health (NIH), of more than 60 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. These NIH-approved lines lack the genetic diversity that researchers need in order to develop effective treatments for millions of Americans.

In spite of recent scientific breakthroughs that suggest alternate means of obtaining stem cells, I must caution my colleagues from thinking that embryonic stem cell research is no longer necessary. I applaud Dr. Anthony Atala and his team at Wake Forest University and Harvard University for their very recent outstanding discoveries. However, I must repeat the caution of Harvard researcher George Daley in saying that these newly discovered cells "are not a replacement for embryonic stem cells"—on the contrary, research for these is entirely complementary. In addition, while we know very little about these new methods, much progress has already been made in the research of embryonic, or pluripotent, stem cells, the most adaptable and unique of all the stem cell varieties. They currently provide scientists with the most possibilities for research and for the discovery of life-saving treatments; as such, we must allow these scientists the opportunity to do so.

It is understandable that many Americans may have moral conflicts with this issue if they believe that embryos need to be destroyed in order for this research to be implemented, but this is not the case. It is estimated that more than 400,000 excess frozen embryos exist in the United States today and that tens of thousands, and perhaps as many as 100,000, are discarded every year.

Further, S. 5 ensures that none of the embryos used in stem cell research is intended for implantation in a woman. All of these embryos would otherwise be discarded. Mr.

Speaker, denying people in our nation who suffer from debilitating illnesses the possible medical benefits that could result from embryonic research is not only cruel but a waste of these valuable life-sustaining stem cells.

This is indeed a matter of ethics—we cannot morally argue that it is better to deny suffering people hope for a cure. Let us provide all people in this world with possibilities for a better future by supporting stem cell research. Let us create the potential for miracles in the lives of paralyzed individuals, those with cancer, or those in need of organ transplants.

This bill provides a limited—yet significant—change in current policy that would result in making many more lines of stem cells available for research. If we limit the opportunities and resources our researchers have today, we only postpone the inevitable breakthrough. Our vote today may determine whether that breakthrough is made by Americans, or not.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill, to vote in favor of scientific innovation, and to vote in favor of a perfect compromise between the needs of science and the boundary of our principles.

Mr. SESSIONS. I continue to reserve my time, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, first, I want to express my enormous appreciation to Congresswoman DIANA DEGETTE.

This morning Speaker PELOSI said, this is really a great day, not only in the United States Congress but for the American people around the country. Many times we deal with issues that are either sort of lower on the list of importance. We name post offices. We give certain honors to individuals. That's all good. But today we're dealing with an issue that affects millions, over 100 million Americans, really not a family that's not touched by Alzheimer's disease, Parkinson's disease, diabetes, as DIANA DEGETTE's daughter is. And like many mothers who come to the Congress and ask us to address issues that have affected their children, DIANA DEGETTE is in a position to actually make something happen, and she has, in the most educated, illuminated, compassionate way, to bring this legislation to the floor of the House of Representatives today.

I also rise in the name of our beloved friend and part of our congressional family, Lane Evans. Lane is one of the million Americans who suffers from Parkinson's disease, who has had to cut his career short. His leadership and dedication to making progress with stem cell research was inspiring. He understood the hope that embryonic stem cell research holds for so many like him. It's time that we pass this bill for people like Lane Evans; a hero, a Marine, someone who has fought all his life. And now we need to fight for him.

I also rise in support of this bill for my friend, Bonnie Wilson, and her daughter, Jenna, who's one of the 7 million American children living with diabetes. Stem cell treatment may be

her only hope. It's time that we finally make progress, put aside ideology, and, yes, it is about ideology versus science, and pay attention to the science. And I want to thank all the children and parents, the children who have diabetes who have come to me year after year after year after year to my office, told me about the shots that they take, the parents waking up several times during the night to check the levels on their children; worrying day and night that they are going to get that phone call that there has been some disaster. It's for them that we do this. And so we're standing today on the brink of incredible scientific breakthroughs that are going to address the issues that plague all our families. My family has been plagued by the early loss of my daughter-in-law, Fiona, to cancer.

Let me just say then, for Fiona and for my grandchildren who were left motherless at a very, very young age, and all the families, I'm not alone. No one's alone in this; that we stand together today to say we believe in a cure. We want to support a cure. We, the American people, through our taxpayer dollars, what could be a better expenditure of that? Should we throw away unused embryonic stem cells? Should we toss in the garbage, literally, the possibility of these cures? I don't think so. Let's take that leap today for our children and future generations.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I'd like to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Every week, Mr. Speaker, medical journals, science periodicals, as well as the mainstream media, announce and report on yet another promise and advance in adult stem cell research and clinical application. Unlike embryonic stem cell research, which has had a poor track record, adult stem cell therapies are not only the present, they are the future as well. Cord blood stem cells, for example, are healing and mitigating a myriad of diseases today and promising research that suggests better therapies to come.

Let me just say a word about embryo destroying stem cell research. It has at least three strikes against it. First, it has an incredible propensity to morph into tumors. Secondly, if embryonic stem cells are ever successful and transplanted into humans, embryonic stem cells carry an enormous proclivity for rejection. And third, embryonic stem cell research requires the killing of human embryos. If it ever worked, the limited supply of so-called spare embryos, and that's a very offensive word, let me just say. Those children who have been adopted from cryogenic tanks—snowflake babies—are a witness against this idea of saying somehow there's a spare embryo. But just take that for what it is. If it ever worked, there would be a near insatiable demand for freshly killed human embryos.

On that last point, let me ask my colleagues to consider what Dr. Robert Lanza, vice president of research and scientific development at Advanced Cell Technology said, and he said, “creating that many lines,” talking about to meet what would be the need, “would require millions of embryos from IVF clinics.”

□ 1115

In the March 16, 2006, edition of Stem Cells, Civin and Rao calculated how many embryos would be needed for clinical applications, and they said that embryonic stem cell lines could reach into the millions if the therapies live up to their potential. Millions of human embryos would be killed. That's unconscionable.

So this is the tip of the iceberg. You are talking about spare embryos now in this debate but if it ever did work, especially when we have an ethical alternative that does work, but if it ever did work, it would mean requiring the killing of millions of embryos, and I don't think enough Members have looked forward enough to realize where this could take us. That is a brave new world. This is the tip of the iceberg today, and hopefully we will not go that way. We must do ethical stem cell research instead.

And let me say one last thing. The Bush administration doubled from 300 to 600 million dollars the amount of money that we are spending on stem cell research. We are passionately in favor of stem cell research, but only the ethical kind.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman on the Rules Committee for yielding to me.

I rise in support of this bill and in support of the promise that comes with funding embryonic stem cell research.

Millions of Americans suffer from diseases for which we might actually find a treatment. Millions more watch family and friends suffer while we deny a chance for a cure. How can we tell a parent watching a child suffer from cancer that we aren't going to do every single thing possible to save that child? How can we tell a child that we won't try to put a halt to the ravages of the Parkinson's disease from which a father or mother is suffering? How can we tell a teenager that there is a chance we could repair a damaged spinal cord so that the teen can walk again but we aren't going to pursue it? How can we tell someone with a family member with Alzheimer's disease that we won't try every single thing possible to fight it?

In my own district, the Buck Institute on Aging is doing great research into lifesaving research with embryonic stem cells. Just recently, they received a grant from the State of California to continue their great work. Private research facilities and States are on the forefront of research, and

the Federal Government must join them.

Today, we have an obligation. We have an obligation to the people of this country to support research that could prevent suffering, that could save countless lives. Federal funding for research in stem cells is vital. It 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 the well-being of millions of Americans; and I, too, want to thank Congresswoman DIANA DEGETTE from Colorado for being such a leader in the stem cell debate.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party, this President, is completely in favor of spending money in doing stem cell research. We, however, are not in favor of putting an olive branch out that is unproven, untested, and up to today has produced no results from embryonic stem cell research.

The real problem with it is that it takes someone else's stem cells and puts them into someone else's body and there is a rejection rate. We know what works best is when a researcher uses stem cells from a person's own body and puts them back into their own body. This is called stem cell research for adults. This is what will lead this country to where it needs to go.

We are simply saying, rather than spending Federal money on untested and unwise decision-making processes that have not led forth to any research that is meaningful, we should spend the money which will yield the best results.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment and extraneous material into the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I will be asking for a “no” vote on the previous question so that we can amend this rule and allow the House to consider a change to the rules of the House to restore accountability and enforcement to the earmark rule.

Mr. Speaker, before I yield back the balance of my time, I want to say thank you very much for your cautious and careful rulings and administration today as the Speaker. I appreciate and respect the way you have conducted yourself in this debate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I include the following statements in support of S. 5:

CANCER RESEARCH AND PREVENTION
FOUNDATION

Embryonic Stem Cell Research and
Regenerative Medicine

JUNE 7, 2007.

The Cancer Research and Prevention Foundation (CRPF) strongly supports efforts to expand the current, restrictive policy governing embryonic stem cell research, under strict, ethical guidelines. The Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act, S. 5, will accomplish the expansion, while maintaining strong ethical standards. Enactment of S. 5 will provide hope to the estimated 1.5 million men, women and children diagnosed with cancer each year.

The House and Senate have both passed legislation in the 110th Congress that will expand the current policy by allowing Federally-funded research to be conducted on embryos derived after August 9, 2001, on leftover embryos that will be otherwise destroyed or discarded by fertility clinics. The legislation ensures that no Federal funds will be used to create or derive embryos for research purposes, nor will any individual be compensated for donation of an embryo for research purposes.

According to a poll recently released by the Coalition for the Advancement of Medical Research, nearly sixty (60) percent of Americans want President Bush to sign the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act into law. More than 500 disease advocacy organizations, universities, professional societies and other organizations have endorsed S. 5 and the Stem cell Research Enhancement Act.

Embryonic stem cell research may hold great potential to improve the prevention, diagnosis and treatment of cancer. Scientific evidence indicates that stem cells provide powerful models of the cellular and molecular origins of many cancer types, helping us better understand the disease and provide insight into critical aspects of cell growth and differentiation altered during tumorigenesis. This work may also improve pre-clinical evaluations of drug toxicity and efficacy, identify markers for early cancer detection and aid in the discovery of novel treatment targets.

The Cancer Research and Prevention Foundation supports embryonic stem cell research, as well as other forms of stem cell research such as bone marrow stem cells, adult stem cells and stem cells derived from cord blood.

Embryonic stem cell research has the potential to benefit millions of Americans suffering from cancer, diabetes, Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, spinal cord injury, heart disease and beyond. In order to realize the full potential of embryonic stem cell research, the Federal Government must act quickly to ensure that research is being conducted with the most scientifically viable stem cell lines available, that the best and brightest medical researchers and clinicians are involved in the field, and that the United States and top research institutions remain leaders in biomedical and regenerative medicine research.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,

June 6, 2007.

Hon. DORIS MATSUI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MATSUI: On behalf of the University of California, I urge your support for S. 5, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act.

S. 5, the stem cell bill that you will consider this week is similar to the House version (H.R. 3) in that it expands the number of stem cell lines that are eligible for

federal funding. It passed the Senate on April 11, 63 to 34. Like H.R. 3, this bipartisan bill also institutes strong ethical requirements to govern stem cell research. S.5 has been amended, however, to include the Alternative Pluripotent Stem Cell Therapies Enhancement Act, S. 2754. The additional provisions from S. 2754 would direct the National Institutes of Health (NIH) to conduct and support basic and applied research to obtain stem cells using alternative methods that would not result in the destruction of an embryo. The University remains fully in support of S. 5 with these changes.

Understanding and realizing the potential of stem cells through the advancement of ethical scientific research is a priority for the University of California and our world-class research enterprise. Your support of S. 5, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act, will enable the University to continue its tireless pursuit of knowledge and scientific breakthroughs that may lead to developing cures for many devastating diseases and conditions and ultimately improve the lives of millions of Californians.

Sincerely,

A. SCOTT SUDDUTH,
Assistant Vice President.

LANCE ARMSTRONG FOUNDATION,
Austin, TX, June 5, 2007.

Hon. DORIS MATSUI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MATSUI: The Lance Armstrong Foundation (LAF) respectfully urges you to vote in favor of S. 5, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act. This legislation will be scored by the LAF as a key vote for cancer survivors.

The LAF unites people to fight cancer. We engage the public at large to pursue an agenda focused on preventing cancer, ensuring access to screening and care, improving the quality of life for people affected by cancer, and investing in needed research.

The LAF supports exploring every avenue of research, including embryonic stem cell research within specified ethical limits, until a cure for cancer is found. The most respected scientists in our field view embryonic stem cells as an area of research that must be explored, and one that our government must make a commitment to support.

S. 5 is identical to legislation that passed the House of Representatives in January, except that the Senate-passed bill contains an added provision that would direct the federal government to conduct and support research on alternative human pluripotent stem cells.

A vote in favor of S. 5, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act, is a vote in support of people affected by cancer and other serious and life-threatening illnesses.

Sincerely,

LANCE ARMSTRONG,
Chairman of the Board.
DOUG ULMAN,
President.

Mr. Speaker, ethical embryonic stem cell research is a reality. It exists, and it can help save lives.

The Federal Government has two options. We can engage by participating in the research and influencing the ethical debate within the global community. Or we can ignore the issue and let others lead.

Again, this is not just my opinion. The Presidentially appointed Director of the NIH said earlier this year, "We cannot be second best in this area . . . I think it is important for us not to fight with one hand tied behind our back here."

I could not agree more. America is the world leader in medical research and development. We cannot cede that ground.

I am in support of this bill for my young friend Scott, 11 years old, who is dealing with diabetes every single day; and for my good friend Sybil, who has Parkinson's disease and asks me all the time to support all stem cell research; and for those with blood or bone marrow cancers or failures like my husband, Bob. It is too late for him but maybe not for others.

The bill made in order under today's rule represents the bipartisan consensus in America on how we combine hope, the scientific consensus, and our values into a policy right for our society.

I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and on the rule.

The material previously referred to by Mr. SESSIONS is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 464 OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS OF TEXAS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new section:

SEC. 3. Clause 9(c) of Rule XXI is amended to read as follows:

"(c) As disposition of a point of order under paragraph (a), the Chair shall put the question of consideration with respect to the bill, joint resolution, or conference report, or amendment described in paragraph (a)(3). The question of consideration shall be debatable for 10 minutes by the Member initiating the point of order and for 10 minutes by an opponent, but shall otherwise be decided without intervening motion except one that the House adjourn."

(The information contained herein was provided by Democratic minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, (VI, 308-311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will say "the

vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the definition of the previous question used in the Floor Procedures Manual published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress, (page 56). Here's how the Rules Committee described the rule using information from Congressional Quarterly's "American Congressional Dictionary": "If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business."

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Democratic majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting, if ordered, on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 195, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 440]

YEAS—221

Abercrombie	Braley (IA)	Cuellar
Ackerman	Brown, Corrine	Cummings
Allen	Butterfield	Davis (AL)
Altmire	Capps	Davis (CA)
Arcuri	Capuano	Davis (IL)
Baca	Cardoza	Davis, Lincoln
Baird	Carnahan	DeFazio
Baldwin	Carney	DeGette
Bean	Carson	Delahunt
Becerra	Castor	DeLauro
Berkley	Chandler	Dicks
Berman	Clarke	Dingell
Berry	Clay	Doggett
Bishop (GA)	Cleaver	Donnelly
Bishop (NY)	Clyburn	Doyle
Blumenauer	Cohen	Edwards
Boren	Cooper	Ellison
Boswell	Costa	Ellsworth
Boucher	Costello	Emanuel
Boyd (FL)	Courtney	Engel
Boyda (KS)	Cramer	Eshoo
Brady (PA)	Crowley	Etheridge

Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchev
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey

Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Mahoney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCullum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Salazar

NAYS—195

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggart
Billirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David

Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof

Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds

Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pitts
Saxton
Platts
Poe
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder

NOT VOTING—16

Andrews
Billbray
Cantor
Conyers
Garrett (NJ)
Hastings (FL)

NOT VOTING—16

Holden
Jefferson
Kagen
Lampson
Marchant
Pickering

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1147

Mrs. MYRICK, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland and Mr. SOUDER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. JACKSON of Illinois, GUTIERREZ and OBERSTAR changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 224, noes 191, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 441]

AYES—224

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berryman
Berman
Bery
Biggart
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyd (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine

Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder

Pomeroy
Porter
Ryan (OH)
Tancredo

Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)

Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Costello
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Lincoln
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake

Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchev
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)

NOES—191

Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline (MN)

Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Viscosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)

Putnam	Sensenbrenner	Tiberi
Radanovich	Sessions	Turner
Rahall	Shadegg	Upton
Rehberg	Shimkus	Walberg
Reichert	Shuler	Walden (OR)
Renzi	Shuster	Walsh (NY)
Reynolds	Simpson	Wamp
Rogers (AL)	Smith (NE)	Weldon (FL)
Rogers (KY)	Smith (NJ)	Weller
Rogers (MI)	Smith (TX)	Westmoreland
Rohrabacher	Souder	Whitfield
Ros-Lehtinen	Stearns	Wicker
Roskam	Stupak	Wilson (NM)
Royce	Sullivan	Wilson (SC)
Ryan (WI)	Taylor	Wolf
Sali	Terry	Young (FL)
Saxton	Thornberry	
Schmidt	Tiaht	

NOT VOTING—17

Bilbray	Holden	Pomerooy
Buyer	Jefferson	Porter
Cantor	Kagen	Ryan (OH)
Conyers	Lampson	Sestak
Garrett (NJ)	Marchant	Tancredo
Hastings (FL)	Pickering	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1154

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I took a leave of absence until 12 p.m. on June 7, 2007, as I was in my district on personal business. The following list describes how I would have voted had I been in attendance this morning.

“Yea”—Motion on ordering the previous question on the rule.

“Aye”—H. Res. 464—Rule providing for consideration of S. 5, to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for human embryonic stem cell research.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 464, I call up the Senate bill (S. 5) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for human embryonic stem cell research, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The text of the Senate bill is as follows:

S. 5

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 2007”.

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.”.

SEC. 3. ALTERNATIVE HUMAN PLURIPOTENT STEM CELL RESEARCH.

Part H of title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 284 et seq.), as amended by section 2, is further amended by inserting after section 498D the following:

“SEC. 498E. ALTERNATIVE HUMAN PLURIPOTENT STEM CELL RESEARCH.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with section 492, the Secretary shall conduct and support basic and applied research to develop techniques for the isolation, derivation, production, or testing of stem cells that, like embryonic stem cells, are capable of producing all or almost all of the cell types of the developing body and may result in improved understanding of or treatments for diseases and other adverse health conditions, but are not derived from a human embryo.

“(b) GUIDELINES.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary, after consultation with the Director, shall issue final guidelines to implement subsection (a), that—

“(1) provide guidance concerning the next steps required for additional research, which shall include a determination of the extent to which specific techniques may require additional basic or animal research to ensure that any research involving human cells using these techniques would clearly be consistent with the standards established under this section;

“(2) prioritize research with the greatest potential for near-term clinical benefit; and

“(3) consistent with subsection (a), take into account techniques outlined by the President’s Council on Bioethics and any other appropriate techniques and research.

“(c) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Not later than January 1 of each year, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to the appropriate committees of the Congress a report describing the activities carried out under this section during the fiscal year, including a description of the research conducted under this section.

“(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect any policy, guideline, or regulation regarding embryonic stem cell research, human cloning by somatic cell nuclear transfer, or any other research not specifically authorized by this section.

“(e) DEFINITION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In this section, the term ‘human embryo’ shall have the meaning given such term in the applicable appropriations Act.

“(2) APPLICABLE ACT.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term ‘applicable appropriations Act’ means, with respect to the fiscal year in which research is to be conducted or supported under this section, the Act making appropriations for the Department of Health and Human Services for such fiscal year, except that if the Act for such fiscal year does not contain the term referred to in paragraph (1), the Act for the previous fiscal year shall be deemed to be the applicable appropriations Act.

“(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2010, to carry out this section.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PAS-TOR). Pursuant to House Resolution 464, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, as we consider S. 5 as passed by the Senate, I am pleased to report that both Houses of Congress have again found common ground on stem cell research policy. This is a matter of utmost importance. We have sent this legislation, or similar legislation on stem cell research, to the President twice. The legislation has been vetoed.

This is a bicameral bill and our actions are clear: We and the American people will not be deterred from enacting potentially life-saving legislation of this kind. For those suffering from diseases such as Alzheimer’s, autism, cancer, cystic fibrosis, heart disease, Parkinson’s or spinal cord injury, stem cell research offers both promise and hope, and that is why we must continue this fight and continue this research.

The legislation lifts the arbitrary date restriction and expands the number of cell lines eligible for federally funded research. It contains strong ethics provisions passed in H.R. 3, ensuring new stem cell lines are only derived from unused embryos created for human fertility treatments that would otherwise be discarded.

I want to be clear: S. 5 does not permit funding for creation or destruction of embryos. This is a critical point. If

not used in research, these stem cells will be discarded as medical waste.

Finally, I note that S. 5 includes the text of the Hope Offered Through Principled and Ethical Stem Cell Research Act, or the HOPE Act, which is Senate language.

At this time I wish to yield now and I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) be permitted to control the time on this side. She has done a superb job in providing leadership on this matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished physician from Denton and Flower Mound, Texas (Mr. BURGESS), a member of the committee.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the speed of scientific investigation certainly exceeds that of the legislative process. Medical research, especially in the field of regenerative medicine, holds great promise, and it is our responsibility to strike an appropriate balance between that which is ethical and the promise that regenerative medicine holds. Science is resolving and providing answers to this ethical dilemma actually without the help of legislation from this Congress, but really through the hard work of dedicated medical researchers.

□ 1200

Yesterday, in an article published in the scientific periodical "Nature," several teams of researchers have been able to make stem cells from a mouse skin cell, a mouse fibroblast, by genetically modifying it with a special technique that they have developed.

So here we have a stem cell that was created from a skin cell without destroying an embryo. These researchers have already shown success with mice by reprogramming mature cells to act like stem cells. This field of cell signaling is going to be very important in the field of regenerative medicine in the decades to come.

These researchers are also working to see how these reprogrammed cells may limit the growth of tumors, a problem identified when using human embryonic stem cells from destroyed embryos.

When we had this discussion last January, Dr. Anthony Atala from Wake Forest University and his Institute of Regenerative Medicine have found that stem cells derived from amniotic fluid, no harm to the baby, no harm to the fetus, cells derived from amniotic fluid have the same or similar characteristics of stem cells derived from embryos. He has been able to build on this research and regrow human organs, bladders in mice, in a handful of cases to do the same thing in humans. Because these stem cells are not from embryos but from the

amniotic fluid or from the placenta, there is much less risk of tumors developing than there is in embryonic stem cells. Because these cells are not from embryos but from the amniotic fluid, there is no harm to the embryo. Over 40 cell lines are available in Dr. Atala's lab.

Mr. Speaker, I am extremely disappointed that we have brought this bill to the floor without a hearing in our committee. The science has moved tremendously. This is the same bill we debated 2 years ago on this House floor. Not a single committee hearing, not a single consideration of how the science has advanced in the past 2 years. That is a shame, and for that reason this bill should be defeated. We should go back to the committee and go through regular order.

Once again, we are debating a bill on the House floor which science has lapped multiple times.

We all agree that medical research, especially in the fields of regenerative medicine hold great promise, but our responsibility is to strike an appropriate balance between the ethical challenges of stem cell research and the promise that it holds.

Science is beginning to address this ethical dilemma without the help of legislation from this Congress, but through the hard work of hundreds of medical researchers.

I would like to call an article in the recent edition of Nature to the Speaker's attention.

Several teams of researchers have been able to make stem cells from a certain type of skin cell genetically modified with retroviruses, without destroying embryos.

These researchers have already shown success with mice by reprogramming mature cells to act like stem cells.

These researchers are also working to see how these reprogrammed cells may also limit the growth of tumors, a problem identified when using stem cells derived from destroyed embryos.

Dr. Anthony Atala, director of Wake Forest University's Institute of Regenerative Medicine, has also found that stem cells derived from amniotic fluid have the same or similar characteristics of stem cells derived from embryos.

He has been able to build on this research and re-grow bladders in mice and in a handful of cases do the same in humans.

Because these stem cells are not from embryos but from amniotic fluid or placenta, there is less risk of tumors.

Over 40 lines are available in Dr. Atala's lab already, and he has the ability to collect more of these very plastic cells in any birthing center.

In fact, I am disappointed that instead of considering a bill that actually does something, which I have cosponsored and introduced by Congressman LIPINSKI, is not before us in place of S. 5.

This bill would provide funding to bank amniotic and placental cells and make them available for research and at some point in the future for actual medical treatments.

This Congress and its leadership has missed an opportunity to hold hearings on this important field of medical research and bring something to the floor that would actually move the science forward.

Instead, we have before us today, an uninformed, morally objectionable bill designed to

inflare political divisions when what America needs is a Federal medical research policy that moves forward in an ethical and responsible manner in real-time, adapting to the needs of science.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express frustration, frustration that I share with millions of Americans around this country. Every day, millions of patients suffer from debilitating diseases and conditions. For many, embryonic stem cell research is the most promising source of potential cures and treatments. Unfortunately, because of the stubbornness of one man, President Bush, these people continue to suffer as they wait.

Since the discovery of embryonic stem cells in 1998, the vast majority of biomedical researchers in this country identify embryonic stem cell research as the most promising source of treatments for diseases like diabetes, Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, spinal cord injury and multiple sclerosis. With the unique ability to become any cell in the body, embryonic stem cells truly are the key to taking science to a whole new level.

Unfortunately, President Bush has stubbornly refused to pay attention to these scientists and the patients who might be helped by this research. In August 2001, the President announced that he would prohibit the National Institutes of Health from funding research on embryonic stem cells lines created after August 2001. Assertions to the contrary, there are fewer than 20 stem cell lines in existence, and most of these researchers are finding less and less workable.

Despite the President's opposition to the research, Congress has acted over and over again for this funding. In 2006, we passed the first bill. This year, as H.R. 3, we passed the second bill. And all of the bills, including S. 5, have the same provisions: Embryos used to derive stem cells which were created for fertility treatments and are in excess of clinical need, the individuals for whom those embryos were created, have determined the embryos are not needed and voluntarily donate them and the individuals provide written consent.

Let me remind my colleagues that under current law there are no ethical guidelines like these that govern any stem cell research that happens today. Unfortunately, the President vetoed the bill. But in the 2006 elections, embryonic stem cell research became a critical issue, and it passed this House again in January with an overwhelming majority.

It is time to pass this bill again now with the Senate language and send a clear message to the President and this country: The majority of Americans want stem cell research.

While the NIH remains limited to a few number of stem cell lines, the rest of the world has eagerly filled the void.

California has recently authorized several billion dollars to conduct embryonic stem cell research. Japan, the U.K., Singapore and others have allocated billions of dollars. But the NIH lags behind. Not only is it not participating in this research, it has lost its cutting edge.

Since I first began working on this issue, public support for embryonic stem cell research has soared. According to a Gallup poll released just this week, since May 2002, it has gone up to 64 percent, steadily increasing.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate gets it. The public gets it. The House gets it. Why doesn't the President of the United States get it?

Opponents of this research say there are other types of cell research that are being explored. And, in fact, yesterday, shockingly, another new advance, which seems to happen every time we bring this bill up. We welcome these advances as we welcome all advances in ethical life-saving research. However, this new scientific research should not be used as an excuse to say that it is a substitute for embryonic stem cell research.

One of the lead researchers, Kevin Eggan, said: "All of us agree strongly with human embryonic stem cell research. These experiments are not motivated by a desire to find an end run around these issues."

This week, in fact, on the other end, embryonic stem cell research has led to huge new advances in curing macular degeneration in England. They believe that embryonic stem cell research will lead to a cure in humans within 5 years.

It is promising research. It is supported by a majority of Americans, by the House, by the Senate. Mr. Speaker, that's why we are here today: the chance for so many to live a life that others take for granted.

Vote for S. 5 to restore hope.

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

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I would like to yield 1 minute to the distinguished congressman from Allentown, Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT), home of the Allentown Canaries.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, we have come to the floor many times over the past few years to discuss the advancement of various forms of stem cell research: adult, cord blood, amniotic, embryonic. We have had discussions about the science and about our moral obligations and about ethics. These discussions have been passionate and heartfelt. We have all come to the floor with the best of intentions.

For some of us, our feelings on these issues have been colored by personal experiences with our own families. For all of us, our stance has been informed by the conversations we have had with our constituents.

I have had countless discussions with my constituents about embryonic stem cell research. In particular, there are two families from my district whose

personal stories have made a profound impact on my thinking about this issue, the Sheaffers from Kempton, Pennsylvania, and the Pitts from Nazareth.

I am very happy that the Pitts family, Melissa and Jeff and their sons, Ryan and Alex, are able to be with us today. I first met Melissa and the boys in 2005. Ryan and Alex are energetic 6-year-old twin boys. You could not tell them apart if not for the fact that Alex is in a wheelchair. Alex suffered a spinal cord injury at birth and has been paralyzed since. Melissa has told me that the promise of embryonic stem cell research gives her hope, hope that advances will allow her son, Alex, to live the same kind of independent life that Ryan will enjoy.

Every day that goes by while we play politics with science is a day that we could have gotten one step closer to finding therapies for kids like Alex. I urge my colleagues to support S. 5. This is an important bill which will ensure that researchers adhere to the highest possible principles of scientific inquiry and respect critical ethical boundaries while advancing some of the most important research of our time.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPP) for 2 minutes.

Mrs. CAPP. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of Senate 5, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act. But then again, you already know that because I have stood on this floor countless times in the past few years expressing this same sentiment.

Today, we have an opportunity to again pass a bill that would direct federally funded, ethical stem cell research and fulfill a promise to the overwhelming majority of Americans who support it.

Fortunately, my State of California has stepped up to the plate and dedicated \$3 billion to embryonic stem cell research. But this is only the first step. Because the only way to make true progress is through coordinated research conducted on a national level. In the meantime, we sit and watch as scientists throughout Europe and the rest of the world make breakthroughs that the United States cannot as long as our researchers' hands are tied.

What amazes me most about this debate today is the rhetoric used by the opposition about using Federal money to create and destroy embryos. But then again, that is just what the opponents want you to believe, when, in fact, it is just plain untrue.

As we have discussed many times before, this bill explicitly mandates that Federal funds only be used to conduct research on stem cells already extracted from embryos created by in vitro fertilization which would have been discarded anyway because the donors no longer need or want them.

Please vote today in favor of this bill that will give hope to millions of Americans, including the loved ones of everyone in this body. My own family

members suffer from diseases that may be cured through embryonic stem cell research. There is really nothing else left to say other than please don't let these people down. Don't tell them that the potential for cures for their diseases are not important enough.

Finally, I want to commend my colleagues, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) and the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), and all of the people who have worked so tirelessly to bring this sound, bipartisan legislation here before us today.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Westminster, South Carolina, which is near the home of the Fighting Clemson Tigers, the starting catcher on the Republican charity baseball team, Mr. GRESHAM BARRETT.

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, several times I have stood here and adamantly spoken against embryonic stem cell research.

I understand that stem cells are necessary for the advancement of medical science. I am encouraged and hopeful of the promising effects stem cell research has for those struggling with debilitating diseases and disabilities, but these solutions can be found without destroying innocent life.

We no longer have to choose between medical advancement and the protection of life. In fact, stem cells derived from adults and umbilical cords have produced over 70 successful therapies, while embryonic stem cell research has produced none.

Mr. Speaker, I do believe in the wonders of science and medical research, and I am hopeful that together we can find cures to these devastating diseases and disabilities, but the end does not justify the means.

The citizens that I represent cannot stand at this podium and speak for the protection of the innocent and those unborn yet do not have a voice, so I ask my colleagues to vote against S. 5. Let's work together to advance the science that we know works and does so without using taxpayer dollars to destroy life.

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

Mr. SPACE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for her leadership on this issue.

I rise today in support of S. 5. In January, I stood before this body to pledge my support for embryonic stem cell research; and I also shared with the House the story of my son, Nicholas, who is now 16 and has battled juvenile diabetes for 10 years.

I asked my colleagues to put aside the differences that they have from a political perspective to support this research that offers the promise of a better quality of life for millions of Americans like my son. When the House passed H.R. 3, I was optimistic. I believed in the power of the government to do good for this Nation and its citizen. I believed we could put politics

aside for a cause of such great importance, but, Mr. Speaker, I was wrong. The administration, even many Members of this body, have succumbed to the vices of the game of politics. They put sound bites ahead of their own citizens.

In the last Congress, my colleagues in both Chambers worked together to craft legislation that would advance the promise of stem cell research. It was a good, bipartisan bill with broad support. Unfortunately, the President saw fit to veto their hard work, nullifying the opportunity that it offered.

Here we are again in the 110th Congress, Mr. Speaker, in exactly the same position we stood 2 years ago. And what has happened in the interim, thousands of children have died from terrible illnesses, and families have been torn apart. In the face of all this, we are having a debate that we have already had. With this enormous opportunity before us, I am saddened and, frankly, frustrated.

Today must be a day to start fulfilling our promise to the people of this country and be leaders on this great issue of importance. The future of our children and loved ones simply cannot wait.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Trenton, New Jersey, the Honorable CHRIS SMITH, who is generally acknowledged as the pro-life leader in the House since Henry Hyde retired.

□ 1215

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in early January, a team of scientists from Wake Forest University and Harvard Medical School announced a historic breakthrough: a new readily available source of life-saving stem cells derived exclusively from amniotic fluid.

The Washington Post called these highly ethically derived pluripotent stem cells "highly versatile and readily available."

Newsweek said, "A new era begins. Stem cells derived from amniotic fluid show great promise in the lab and may end the divisive ethical debate once and for all because the amniotic fluid stem cells are pluripotent, able to transform into cells representing each of the three major kinds of tissues found in the body."

And ABC News pointed out that these stem cells can be taken from amniotic fluid with no harm to either the mother or her unborn child.

Earlier this week, I met with the Wake Forest University researcher, Dr. Anthony Atala, who led the team credited with this extraordinary study. Dr. Atala made it absolutely clear that these amniotic stem cells are pluripotent and that this research, along with numerous other remarkable initiatives in regenerative medicine, are progressing robustly.

Mr. Speaker, in April, the Journal of the American Medical Association reported that cord blood stem cells, not embryonic stem cells, were transplanted into 15 patients diagnosed with Type I diabetes and resulted in 13 becoming completely insulin-free.

We all know about the New York Times and the other news media carrying the surprise development that's in today's papers.

Finally, let me say, Mr. Speaker, recently Richard Doerflinger of the U.S. Catholic Conference compiled a comprehensive list of what he calls New Reasons for Hope, 111 recent developments published since Congress's stem cell votes of 2006. It is filled with one breakthrough after another, all attributed to adult stem cells, cord blood, amniotic fluid and the like. That's where the hope is, not in destroying embryos so as to derive their stem cells.

Vote "no" on this bill.

111 *New REASONS TO RECONSIDER THE ALLEGED NEED FOR STEM CELL RESEARCH THAT DESTROYS HUMAN EMBRYOS*

Recent Advances (published since 109th Congress's stem cell votes) in Adult Stem Cell Research and Other Alternatives to Embryonic Stem Cell Research

June 2006–early June 2007

OVERALL SUCCESS

"Adult cells are behind much of stem cell success so far," Milwaukee Journal Sentinel, September 2, 2006, www.jsonline.com/story/index.aspx?id=489953&format=print

"Review: Ex Vivo Engineering of Living Tissues with Adult Stem Cells," Tissue Engineering, October, 2006, <http://lib.bioinfo.pl/pmid:17064229>

"Cleveland BioLabs Protectan CBLB612 Demonstrates Efficacy In Stimulating Proliferation And Mobilization Of Bone Marrow Stem Cells In Primate Model," Medical News Today, April 21, 2007, www.medicalnewstoday.com/medical-ews.php?newsid=68477

ADULT STEM CELL VERSATILITY

"Adult stem cells are touchy-feely, need environmental clues," EurekAlert, August 24, 2006, www.eurekalert.org/pub_releases/2006-08/uop-uop082306.php

"Induction of Pluripotent Stem Cells from Mouse Embryonic and Adult Fibroblast Cultures by Defined Factors," Cell, August 25, 2006, www.cell.com/content/article/abstract?uid=PIIS0092867406009767

&highlight=Yamanaka
"Adult Stem Cells Can Become Muscle," The Daily Californian, November 1, 2006, <http://dailycal.org/printable.php?id=22084>

"U of MN adult stem cell research shows promise for transplant therapies," EurekAlert, January 15, 2007, www.eurekalert.org/pub_releases/2007-01/uom-uom011207.php

"Fate of Bone Marrow Stem Cells Transplanted into the Testis," The American Journal of Pathology, March 2007, <http://ajp.amjpathol.org/cgi/content/abstract/170/3/899>

"Type of Stem Cell Found to Reside in Transplanted Lungs," eMaxHealth, March 10, 2007, www.emaxhealth.com/cms?m=show&opt=printable&id=10162

STEM CELL SOURCES

"Clonogenic multipotent stem cells in human adipose tissue differentiate into functional smooth muscle cells," Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, June 12,

2006, www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.0604850103

"Fat Stem Cells Being Studied As Option For Breast Reconstruction," Medical News Today, October 30, 2006, www.medicalnewstoday.com/printerfriendlynews.php?newsid=55275

"Penn Prof. Makes 'Hair'-Raising Stem Cell Discovery," The Evening Bulletin (Philadelphia), November 17, 2006, www.zwire.com/site/index.cfm?newsid=17480108&BRD=2737&PAG=461&dept_id=576361&rfti=8

"Isolation of a Novel Population of Multipotent Adult Stem Cells from Human Hair Follicles," The American Journal of Pathology, December 2006, <http://ajp.amjpathol.org/cgi/content/abstract/168/6/1879?maxtoshow=&HITS=10&hits=10&RESULTFORMAT=&author1=Yu&titleabstract=Isolation+of+a+novel+population+of+multipotential+adult+stem+cells+from+human+hair+searchid=1&FIRSTINDEX=0&resourcetype=HWCIT>

"Stem cells found in adult hair follicles may provide alternative to embryonic stem cells," EurekAlert, December 11, 2006, www.eurekalert.org/pub_releases/2006-12/mcow-scf121106.php

"Don't Surrender Any More Teeth to the Tooth Fairy," Scientific American, December 26, 2006, www.sciam.com/print_version.cfm?articleID=C0956FBC-E7F2-099DF-3DF2604378A72C61

"Isolation of amniotic stem cell lines with potential for therapy," Nature Biotechnology, January 7, 2007, www.nature.com/nbt/journal/v25/n1/abs/nbt1274.html

"Bioengineer Advances Survival, Promise of Adult Stem Cells," Science Daily, February 28, 2007, www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2007/02/070227121355.htm

"Liposuctioned fat stem cells to repair bodies," Medical News Today, February 24, 2007, <http://www.medicalnewstoday.com/medicalnews.php?newsid=63649>

CORD BLOOD

"States seek to save umbilical cord blood," Stateline.org (Pew Research Center), August 2, 2006, www.stateline.org/live/printable/story?contentId=131281

"State expands storage for stem-cell-rich blood," North Jersey Media Group, Inc., October 18, 2006, www.northjersey.com/print.php?qrst=ZmdiZWw3Zjd2cWVIRUV5eTcwMDY30DKmeXJpck3ZicxN2Y3dnFIZUVFeXkl

"Stem cell transplant: a ray of hope for thalassemic children," The Hindu, October 26, 2006, www.thehindu.com/2006/10/26/stories/2006102614470200.htm

"Cytotherapy Report Confirms BioE Stem Cell First Human Cord Blood Stem Cell to Differentiate into Lung Cell," BioE News Release (St. Paul, MN), November 1, 2006, <http://www.bioe.com/Detail/Detail.aspx?catID=15&itemID=971>

"New Use of Cord Blood to Treat Childhood Leukemia Study," Yahoo News, January 5, 2007, http://www.cordblood.com/cord_blood_news/stem_cell_news/autologous_leukemia.asp

"First Israeli saved from acute leukemia by umbilical cord blood from two separate births," Jerusalem Post, February 12, 2007, www.jpost.com/servlet/Satellite?cid=1170359842760&pagename=JPost%2FJPostArticle%2FPrinter

"Caged Protein Helps Double Cord Blood Stem Cells in Culture," TherapeuticsDaily, April 24, 2007, <http://www.therapeuticsdaily.com/news/article.cfm?contenttype=sentrvaricle&contentvalue=1328638&channelID=28>

Cord Blood Registry Launches "Heroic" Campaign to Increase Awareness of

Medical Benefits of Cord Blood Stem Cells," Genetic Engineering & Biotechnology News, May 23, 2007, <http://www.genengnews.com/news/bnitem.aspx?name=17897553>

BONE/CARTILAGE

"Gene Silencing Directs Muscle-derived Stem Cells to Become Bone-forming Cells," Medical News Today, June 1, 2006, www.medicalnewstoday.com/medicalnews.php?newsid=44400

"One-Off Treatment to Stop Back Pain—Using Patients' Own Stem Cells," Innovations Report Web site, November 30, 2006, http://www.innovations-report.de/html/berichte/medizin_gesundheit/bericht-75132.html

"Aussie stem cell trial wins US approval," The Age (Australia), December 20, 2006, www.theage.com.au/news/National/Aussie-stem-cell-trial-wins-US-approval/2006/12/20/1166290605626.html

"Stem cells revolutionize spinal surgery," Victoria Advocate (Texas), February 3, 2007, <http://www.cmbt.su/eng/news/news879.html>

"Case Study Reports That Orthopedic Trauma Surgeon Injects Adult Stem Cells Derived From the Patient's Own Marrow Into Her Broken Legs, Which Had Not Healed by Seven Months Post-Injury—Instead of Open Surgery," Yahoo Finance, February 8, 2007, <http://biz.yahoo.com/iw/070208/0213099.html?printer=1>

"Healing Bone with Stem Cells," Technology Review (Published by MIT), March 7, 2007, www.technologyreview.com/printer_friendly_article.aspx?id=18274

"System For Expanding Stem Cells To Form Cartilage Tissue Under Development," ScienceDaily, April 20, 2007, www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2007/04/070419101148.htm

"Horses lead humans in stem cells race," Reuters, April 24, 2007, <http://www.reuters.com/article/scienceNews/idUSL1769041120070424?feedType=RSS>

BRAIN DAMAGE

"Transplanted adult neural progenitor cells survive, differentiate and reduce motor function impairment in a rodent model of Huntington's disease," Experimental Neurology, June 2006, www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?db=pubmed&cmd=Retrieve&dopt=AbstractPlus&list_uids=16626705&query_hl=3&itool=pubmed_DocSum

"Researchers Find Healing Potential in Everyday Human Brain Cells," Newswise, August 16, 2006, www.newswise.com/p/articles/view/522823/

"Scientists spur growth of adult brain stem cells," MSNBC (Reuters), November 14, 2006, www.msnbc.msn.com/id/15720021/print/1/displaymode/1098/

"An appointment with chance," The Economist, November 30, 2006, www.economist.com/science/PrinterFriendly.cfm?story_id=8348729

"Cells' Capability in Mouse Brain Tissue Repair Revealed By UCSF Stem Cell Study," Medical News Today, December 21, 2006, www.medicalnewstoday.com/printerfriendly.php?newsid=59133

"Scientists produce neurons from human skin," EurekAlert, February 22, 2007, www.eurekalert.org/pub_releases/2007-02/uls022207.php

"Stem Cells Fill In When Smell-related Cells Fail," ScienceDaily, May 3, 2007, www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2007/04/070429154913.htm (Also see: "Contribution of olfactory neural stem cells to tissue maintenance and regeneration," Nature Neuroscience, April 29, 2007, www.nature.com/neuro/journal/vaop/ncurrent/abs/nn1882.html)

"China hope for cerebral palsy girl," MSN (United Kingdom), May, 25, 2007, <http://>

news.uk.msn.com/Article.aspx?cp-documentid=4988374

CANCER

"Catholic Priest's Adult Stem Cell Donation Saves Kentucky Woman's Life," LifeNews.com (Kansas City, MO), June 29, 2006, <http://66.195.16.55/bio1580.html>

"Cancer-Killing Invention Also Harvests Stem Cells," Medical News Today, January 8, 2007, www.medicalnewstoday.com/printerfriendlynews.php?newsid=60251

"Researchers first to map gene that regulates adult stem cell growth," EurekAlert, January 14, 2007, www.eurekalert.org/pub_releases/2007-01/uok-rft011207.php

"A new hope for cancer treatment: 'U' researchers find stem cells that cause tumors," Michigan Daily, February 2, 2007, www.michigandaily.com/home/index.cfm?event=displayArticlePrinter-Friendly&uStory_id=c5489b59-d0ef-43f2-8597-66a769ac3a1e

DIABETES

"Stem cells may help Bergen boy fight diabetes," NorthJersey.com (North Jersey Media Group Inc.), August 18, 2006, www.northjersey.com/page.php?qrtr=eXJpcnk3Zjcx-N2Y3dnFIZUVFeXkzJmZnYmVsN2Y3dnFIZUVFeXkz0Tc3MTcx

"International Trial of the Edmonton Protocol for Islet Transplantation," New England Journal of Medicine, September 28, 2006, <http://content.nem.org/cgi/content/full/355/13/1318?firstpage=1318&volume=355&sendit=GO&searchid=1&FIRSTINDEX=0&volume=355&firstpage=1318&resourcetype=HWGIT>

"Insulin Stem Cells Hold Hope for Diabetes Treatment," Forbes, November 7, 2006, www.forbes.com/forbeslife/health/feeds/h-scout/2006/11/07hscout535944.html

"Multipotent stromal cells from human marrow home to and promote repair of pancreatic islets and renal glomeruli in diabetic NOD scid mice," Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences (PNAS), November 14, 2006, www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&dopt=Abstract&list_uids=17088535/

"AmCyte Presents Promising Adult Stem Cell Data at 7th Annual Rachmiel Levine Diabetes and Obesity Symposium," Genetic Engineering News, November 9, 2006, www.genengnews.com/news/bnitem.aspx?name=8531775&child=4&taxid=39

"Researchers Make Stem Cell Breakthrough," The Korea Times, January 23, 2007, <http://ora.ra.cwru.edu/stemcellcenter/news/News%20January%2007/Researchers%20Make%20Stem%20Cell%20Breakthrough.htm>

"Diabetes repair 'occurs in womb'," BBC News, January 23, 2007, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/health/6286997.stm>

"Autologous Nonmyeloablative Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplantation in Newly Diagnosed Type 1 Diabetes Mellitus," Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA), April 11, 2007, <http://ama-assn.org/cgi/content/full/297/14/1568> (Also see: "Stem cell experiment lets diabetics forgo insulin," MSNBC.com, April 10, 2007, www.msnbc.msn.com/id/18040485/print/1/displaymode/1098/)

"Wnt signaling regulates pancreatic beta cell proliferation," Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences (PNAS), Advance Online Publication April 2007, <http://www.pnas.org/cgi/content/abstract/0701509104v1>

"Adult Stem/Progenitor Cells Repair Of Damaged Brain, Pancreas, Kidney Cells Newly Understood," Medical News Today, May 3, 2007, www.medicalnewstoday.com/medicalnews.php?newsid=69354

"Directed engineering of umbilical cord blood stem cells to produce C-peptide and insulin," Cell Proliferation, June 2007, <http://www.blackwell-synergy.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1365-2184.2007.00439.x>

EYE/EAR

"Bone Marrow May Restore Cells Lost in Vision Diseases," Science Daily (University of Florida), June 8, 2006, www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2006/06/060608225650.htm

"Eye experts showcase new treatments for glaucoma," ABC Sydney, November 7, 2006, www.abc.net.au/news/items/200611/1783265.htm?sydney

"Retinal repair by transplantation of photoreceptor precursors," Nature, November 9, 2006, www.nature.com/nature/journal/v444/n7116/abs/nature05161.html

"Study shows isolation of stem cells may lead to a treatment for hearing loss," EurekAlert, April 5, 2007, www.eurekalert.org/pub_releases/2007-04/cwru-ss040507.php

"Stem cell patch restores vision," The University of Melbourne Voice, April 16-30, 2007, <http://univnews.unimelb.edu.au/articleid/4135.html> (Also see: "Nearly-blind, But Saved By Stem Cell Patch," Bernama: Malaysian National News Agency, April 18, 2007, www.bernama.com.my/bernama/v3/news.php?id=257390)

"Bone Marrow Stem Cells May Cure Eye Disease," University of Cincinnati Health News, May 10, 2007, <http://healthnews.uc.edu/news/?/4881>

HEART

"Researchers grow human heart tissue from stem cells," ABC Online, June 7, 2006, www.abc.net.au/worldtoday/content/2006/s1657710.htm

"Stem Cell Trials Show Sustained Heart Function Improvement," Medical News Today, September 21, 2006, www.medicalnewstoday.com/medicalnews.php?newsid=52366

"Cultured autologous stem cell trials show sustained heart function improvement," Managed Care Business Week, October 17, 2006, www.newsrx.com/article.php?articleID=365417

"Injecting Patient's Own Stem Cells Treats Severe Coronary Artery Disease," Medical News Today, October 24, 2006, www.medicalnewstoday.com/printerfriendlynews.php?newsid=54836

"Using the Body's Own Stem Cells to Grow New Arteries," KGO-TV/ABC-7 (San Francisco), November 12, 2006, <http://abclocal.go.com/kgostory?section=edell&id=4754901&ft=print>

"Adult Pig Stem Cells Show Promise in Repairing Animals' Heart Attack Damage," Johns Hopkins University Web site, November 13, 2006, www.hopkinsmedicine.org/Press_releases/2006/11_13_06.html

"Amniotic Stem Cells Offer Hope Against Congenital Heart Defects," Washington Post, November 14, 2006, www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/11/14/AR2006111400889_pf.html

"Potential Source of Stem Cells for Heart Repair, Other Uses Found in Fat of Elderly, Chronically Diseased Patients: Presented at AHA," Doctor's Guide, November 17, 2006, www.docguide.com/news/content.nsf/NewsPrint/852571020057CCF685257229005A86CB

"Adult Heart Cells Learn to Heal," Medical News Today, November 20, 2006, www.medicalnewstoday.com/printerfriendlynews.php?newsid=57088

"U of M Finds Cell in Adult Heart with Embryonic Stem Cell Capability," Academic Health Center at the University of Minnesota, January 18, 2007, www.ahc.umn.edu/print/news/releases/heartcell011807/home.html

"Desperation leads to one last gamble in overcoming heart failure," Orlando Sentinel, January 28, 2007, <http://www.orlandosentinel.com/features/health/orl-stemcell12807jan28,0,2065178.story?coll=orl-dp-classifieds>

"Stem cells from fat transplanted into heart," MSNBC (Reuters), February 6, 2007, www.msnbc.msn.com/id/17007196/print/1/displaymode/1098/

"Heart patients head to Bangkok for life-saving stem cell treatment," Vescell Web Site, February 13, 2007, <http://www.vescell.com/stem-cell-news/88>

"M.D. Anderson moves forward in heart repair research," Houston Business Journal, February 15, 2007, <http://masshightech.bizjournals.com/masshightech/othercities/houston/stories/2007/02/12/daily66.html?t=printable>

"Sticky" Proteins Fuse Adult Stem Cells to Cardiac Muscle, Repairing Hearts," Newswise, February 15, 2007, www.newswise.com/p/articles/view/527347

"FDA Approves Phase 1 Stem Cell Research Therapy for Congestive Heart Failure," PRLog—Online Press Release Service, March 25, 2007, www.prlog.org/10011668-fdaapprovesphase-1-stem-cell-research-therapy-for-congestive-heart-failure.html

"Osiris' Adult Stem Cells Help Heart Attack Patients in Study," Bloomberg News Service, March 25, 2007, http://quote.bloomberg.com/apps/news?pid=20670001&refer=&sid=a_YZBRXSfIKs

"British team grows human heart valve from stem cells," The Guardian (UK), April 2, 2007, www.guardian.co.uk/print/0,329765220-110418,00.html

"Valley cardiologist develops technique to repair tissue in heart attack patients," The Arizona Republic, April 13, 2007, http://www.azcentral.com/community/chandler/articles/0413_heart0413.html

"Stem Cell Trial Involves Austin Heart Patients," CBS Broadcasting (Austin, TX), May 9, 2007, http://keytv.com/topstories/local_story_129184435.html

"Turning gene 'on' helped mice fix broken hearts," Reuters, May 10, 2007, <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/18602323/>

IMMUNE SYSTEM (MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS, LUPUS, ETC.)

"Stem Cell Treatment Eliminates Lupus," ABC7/KGO-TV/DT (San Francisco), June 5, 2006, <http://abclocal.go.com/kgo/story?section=edell&id=4238935&ft=print>

"Adult stem cells in the treatment of autoimmune diseases," Rheumatology, October, 2006, <http://rheumatology.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/abstract/45/10/1187>

"Hematopoietic stem cell transplantation in autoimmune diseases: the ahmedabad experience," Transplant Proceedings, April 2007, http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?tmpl=NoSidebarfile&db=PubMed&cmd=Retrieve&list_uids=17445577&dopt=Abstract

"Cellerant Therapeutics Reversed Auto-immune Disease in Lupus Mice with Transplant of Purified Donor Blood Stem Cells," Business Wire, April 23, 2007, http://home.businesswire.com/portal/site/google/index.jsp?ndmViewId=news_view&newsId=20070423005730&newsLang=en

"Stem cell treatment may ease MS suffering," Irish Times, May 1, 2007, http://www.therapeuticsdaily.com/news/article.cfm?contentValue=1339640&content_type=sentryarticle&channelID=29

KIDNEY/LIVER

"Isolation and Characterization of Multipotent Progenitor Cells from the Bowman's Capsule of Adult Human Kidneys," Journal of the American Society of Nephrology, August 2, 2006, [http://jasn.asnjournals.org/cgi/content/abstract/17/9/2443?maxtoshow="](http://jasn.asnjournals.org/cgi/content/abstract/17/9/2443?maxtoshow=)

&HITS=10&hits=10&RESULTFORMAT=&author1=Sagrinati%2C+C&fulltext=kidneys&searchid=1&FIRSTINDEX=0&sortspec=relevance&volume=17&firstpage=2443&resource=HWCIT

"British scientists grow human liver in a laboratory," Daily Mail (United Kingdom), Oct. 30, 2006, www.dailymail.co.uk/pages/text/print.html?in_article_id=413551&in_page_id=1770

"Stem Cells Speed Growth of Healthy Liver Tissue," ScienceDaily, March 28, 2007, www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2007/03/070327094518.htm

MUSCULAR DYSTROPHY/MUSCLE REPAIR

"Mesoangioblast stem cells ameliorate muscle function in dystrophic dogs," Nature, November 15, 2006, www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?db=pubmed&list_uids=17108972&cmd=Retrieve&indexed=google

"Human adult stem cells regenerate muscle," United Press International, February 15, 2007, www.upi.com/NewsTrack/Science/20070215-024231-4646r/

"Stem cells used to treat incontinence," USA Today, May 21, 2007, www.usatoday.com/news/health/2007-05-21-muscle-cells_N.htm

"Injection of Autologous Muscle Stem Cells (Myoblasts) for the Treatment of Vocal Fold Paralysis: A Pilot Study," The Laryngoscope, May 2007, <http://www.laryngoscope.com/pt/re/laryngoscope/abstract.0005537-200705000-00032.htm>

"Muscle-Building Stem Cells Point To Regenerative Therapies For Muscular Disease," Stem Cell Research News, May 31, 2007, <http://www.stemcellresearchnews.com/absolutenm/anmviewer.asp?a=673&z=5>

PARKINSON'S DISEASE

"Stem Cell Treatment Proven to Reduce Parkinson's Symptoms," Medical News Today, October 25, 2006, www.medicalnewstoday.com/printerfriendlynews.php?newsid=54956

"Generation of Functional Dopamine Neurons from Neural Precursor Cells Isolated from the Subventricular Zone and White Matter of the Adult Rat Brain Using Nurrl Overexpression," Stem Cells, May 2007, <http://stemcells.alphamedpress.org/cgi/content/short/25/5/1252>

SPINAL CORD

"Olfactory Mucosa Autografts in Human Spinal Cord Injury: A Pilot Clinical Study," Journal of Spinal Cord Medicine, 2006, www.apssci.org/pdf/olfactory.pdf

"Bone marrow stromal cells can achieve cure of chronic paraplegic rats: Functional and morphological outcome one year after transplantation," Science Direct, July 10, 2006, www.sciencedirect.com/science?ob=ArticleURL&_udi=B6T0G-4K0FJWC-2&user=10&coverDate=07%2F10%2F2006&_alid=469379479&rdoc=1&fmt=summary&orig=search&cdi=4862&sort=d&docanchor=&view=c&acct=C000050221&version1&urlVersion=0&userid=10&md5=203dead71214575a7c9c0ff0390ae8c9

"Pioneering steps for spine treatment," Atlanta Business Chronicle, October 23, 2006, atlanta.bizjournals.com/atlanta/stories/2006/10/23/story6.html

"The use of hemopoietic stem cells derived from human umbilical cord blood to promote restoration of spinal cord tissue and recovery of hindlimb function in adult rats," Journal of Neurosurgery, Spine (JNAS), November 2006, www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?tmpl=NoSidebarfile&db=PubMed&cmd=Retrieve&list_uids=17120892&dopt=Abstract

"Man walks, courtesy stem cell therapy," The Tribune (India), February 25, 2007, www.tribuneindia.com/2007/20070226/main7.htm

"Neuralstem's Cells Restore Motor Function In Spinal Ischemia-Paralyzed Rats," Medical News Today, May 31, 2007, www.medicalnewstoday.com/medicalnews.php?newsid=72613

WOUNDS/BURNS

"Adult Stem Cells Can Reduce the Side Effects of Radiation Therapy," FreeRepublic.com (Fresno, CA), October 9, 2006, www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/1716594/posts

"IU doctors treating PAD with stem cells," South Bend Tribune (Indiana), December 13, 2006, www.southbendtribune.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20061213/Lives08/612130449-1/LIVES05/CAT=Lives08

"Aldagen Announces Texas Heart Institute as First Site in its Stem Cell Clinical Trial to Treat Critical Limb Ischemia," Medical News Today, December 16, 2006, www.medicalnewstoday.com/printerfriendlynews.php?newsid=59182

"Amatokin(R), the Controversial 'Stem Cell' Mystery Wrinkle Cream Comes to America," Business Wire, April 10, 2007, <http://biz.yahoo.com/bw/20070410005130.html?v=1>

"Nonmyeloablative Stem Cell Therapy Enhances Microcirculation and Tissue Regeneration in Murine Inflammatory Bowel Disease," Gastroenterology, March 2007, www.gastrojournal.org/article/PIIS0016508506026795/abstract

"Baldness breakthrough: Stem cells coaxed into growing hair," (London) Daily Mail, May 16, 2007, www.dailymail.co.uk/pages/live/articles/technology/technology.html?in_article_id=455382&in_page_id=1965

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), a true hero on this issue.

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise in support of the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act and to be a part of a Congress that has made this a top priority.

I particularly want to recognize the great work of Congresswoman DEGETTE, the gentlewoman from Colorado, for her outstanding leadership in this issue, and the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) for his leadership as well.

This legislation, Mr. Speaker, has strong bipartisan support in both Chambers of Congress. It enjoys the support of up to 70 percent of the American people, and this legislation, stem cell research, offers hope and the promise of a cure to millions of people around the world who are struggling with some of life's most challenging chronic conditions and diseases and disabilities.

Mr. Speaker, I became paralyzed almost 27 years ago as a young police cadet, standing in a locker room when a police officer's gun accidentally discharged, the bullet going into my neck and severing my spinal cord.

It's been an incredible journey and, at times, a difficult one. I was told

back then that I would never walk again, but I have hope and faith, and I've always believed that somehow, through the miracle of science and research, that some day they would find a cure for spinal cord injuries. That day, that hope of a cure, has never been more real than it is today because of stem cell research.

Now, I recognize, though, this isn't just about JIM LANGEVIN or people suffering from spinal cord injuries. This is also about the millions of other people across America and throughout the world who are suffering from diseases, such as Parkinson's disease, Alzheimer's, juvenile diabetes, cancer and so many others, that could potentially be helped by stem cell research.

Now, I have to be the first to admit that my understanding of stem cell research has evolved and involved ongoing education, thought and prayer. In fact, unlike many of my colleagues who support the stem cell research bill before us, I'm opposed to abortion. The fact that my life hung by a thread, I'm reminded every day how precious a gift life truly is.

But I'm committed to the protection of life at all stages, and I've not taken my decision to support this legislation lightly.

Over the years, I had the good fortune to learn about stem cell research from some of America's renowned scientists, pro-life leaders like Senator ORRIN HATCH and also a dear friend who is certainly on my mind today, Christopher Reeve. So many people have helped me to come to the position to support this research, again because of the hope that it offers.

Now, in addition to all of these reasons, I believe that this legislation is vitally important because it provides appropriate safeguards for those that are in S. 5 so it can be done ethically and responsibly.

This offers great hope, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to recognize the gentleman from Highland Park, Illinois (Mr. KIRK) for 2 minutes.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this stem cell research bill because, in my judgment, we should support several key principles: number one, that America should always lead with regard to medical research; number two, that doctors and scientists should guide medical cures; and number three, that hope for patients facing cancer or diabetes or Alzheimer's should be our top priority.

American leadership, doctors in charge, new hope for patients, oh, and bipartisan cooperation to make each of these ideals a reality, that's why we should support this bill.

In my home State of Illinois, our researchers and doctors are forging ahead like Dr. John Kessler, one of the leading researchers in the field of embryonic stem cell research at Northwestern University, who said "stem cell biology promises to revolutionize the practice of medicine."

I've also met with Dr. Daniel Peterson, an associate professor of neuroscience at Rosalind Franklin University of Medicine and Science in north Chicago, working on a project where stem cells are used for structural brain repair, a critical treatment for soldiers suffering from post-traumatic stress that offers new hope for veterans.

Or even a reference to today's Chicago Tribune, which talked about Dr. Richard Burt of Northwestern University and his work on stem cell research which could offer a cure for Type I diabetes.

Bringing hope to these patients and making sure the United States is in the lead and making sure that doctors are guiding this research and cures, not politicians, that's why we should pass this bill, and that's why I strongly support it.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague on the Energy and Commerce Committee for yielding to me.

I want to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague from Illinois (Mr. KIRK). That's why I'm here today. We have another opportunity today, Mr. Speaker, to give real hope to millions of Americans suffering from incurable diseases.

These are our constituents, our family members and our friends who cannot afford to wait much longer while this administration stubbornly refuses to accept the people's will.

Poll after poll shows that between 60 and 70 percent of the American people support the expansion of embryonic stem cell research to discover more effective cures and treatment for the diseases that plague our times—juvenile diabetes, Alzheimer's and Parkinson's, just to name a few.

Every religion in the world teaches us to do all we can to ease the burden of human suffering.

The administration's current stem cell policy flies in the face of that shared goal and shuts the door of hope to too many Americans awaiting a cure.

I know a majority of my colleagues agree with me, and I hope the President hears us loud and clear and will finally respond to the Congress's, and the American people's, desire for expanded embryonic stem cell research.

Last week I saw what happens in research at the University of Texas Health Sciences Center. The private research is in one lab, and the NIH research is in a separate lab, duplicating facilities. What a waste of our scientific dollars, whether it comes from the taxpayers or from the individual and foundations. What a waste to have to do this, duplicate two labs, to be able to do this research.

And, Mr. Speaker, we know people, not just my colleague from Rhode Island, but I know a young lady 26 years

old who had her spinal cord severed. Her only hope is embryonic stem cell research, and I'm glad to hear our colleague from Rhode Island talk about his experience. And he gives hope to this young lady who has no hope right now, except hopefully she'll be able to move her fingers.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the Golden State of California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN), the former Attorney General of California.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let's understand some first principles. Human dignity is not reserved for adult human beings. The premise of human rights protections is that they are not contingent on arbitrary criteria such as size or location.

Ethical considerations must be weighed in light of the advances being made using adult stem cells, including those derived from cord blood. As has been mentioned, those advances are substantiated by peer review studies confirming improvement in many types of cancers, cerebral palsy, sickle cell anemia, paralyzing injuries, autoimmune diseases, metabolic disorders, neural degenerative diseases and heart damage.

This is consistent with the second principle of the Nuremberg Code, the directives for experimental human subject research, which are published at the Web site of NIH.

The principle reads simply, "The experiment should be as to yield fruitful results for the good of society, unprocurable by other methods or means of study, and not random and unnecessary in nature."

Or as President Clinton's National Bioethics Advisory Commission said, "In our judgment, the derivation of stem cells from embryos remaining following infertility treatments is justifiable only if no less morally problematic alternatives are available for advancing research."

Well, we know they are. We talked about, before the House debating the bill earlier this year, the study published in Nature Biotechnology Journal, finding that amniotic fluids contain cells that can be cloned to produce stem cells to behave like embryonic stem cells.

We had today's article referring to the Nature Journal, publishing a study, showing that normal skin cells can be reprogrammed into an embryonic state in mice.

Instead of embracing this, we hear from the gentlewoman from Colorado, her words, shockingly, another scientific result reported yesterday. They seem to always come up whenever we're debating the bill. They are because that's what science is doing.

Vote this bill down.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to recognize the gentleman

from Lubbock, Texas, home of the Texas Tech Red Raiders (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) for 1 minute.

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

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, you're going to hear a lot of perspectives today, but I wanted to give you a perspective from my friend James Clark. James wrote me this letter about stem cell research.

"In October 2004, I was involved in a car crash which has left me paralyzed from the waist down . . . Given the current technology and my condition, there is no hope of full recovery."

James goes on to say, "I fully support ethical forms of stem cell research. I believe, based on news accounts, that stem cells could be the key to a full recovery for me. To walk again and regain complete independence," would be, "a joyous day for me and my family. I can only imagine how many American people would also benefit.

"But, Congressman, I believe there is a very dark side to stem cell research. There are those who believe stem cells should be taken from living embryos. In my opinion, the killing of an embryo for the harvest of stem cells is exactly the same as killing another human being. Under no circumstances do I wish to benefit from the stem cells that result from the harming or killing of a human embryo. No thanks, I'll stay in this wheelchair."

Clearly, James has a lot to gain from scientific breakthroughs in stem cell research. Let's spend our money where we can get breakthroughs. Let's continue adult stem cells.

So let's focus taxpayer dollars on research that has shown promise.

Adult stem cell research, and other research that doesn't lead to the destruction of human life, have produced more than 70 treatments.

On the other hand, stem cell research on embryos has produced ZERO treatments or cures that could help James walk again.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this bill so that we can focus our resources on ethical and promising adult stem cell research that could help my good friend James get rid of his wheelchair.

Vote "no" on this bill.

CONGRESSMAN NEUGEBAUER, Thank you for letting me share my concerns with you about a matter of great importance to millions of Americans. The Congress debates again the issue of stem cell research for which history, generations of Americans to come, and God himself will judge us. For so very many reasons it is important that we get this issue right.

In October 2004 I was involved in a car crash, which has left me paralyzed from the waist down. Further complicating any hope of recovery, I suffer a rare form of spinal cord injury resulting from anoxia or loss of blood flow to the spinal cord. Given the current technology and my condition there is no hope of full recovery.

Other people suffer conditions far worse than mine but just to establish my background let me share with you the following: I cannot use my legs, nor can I feel them. I suffer DVT's (blood clots in the veins) from

the lack of mobility, lack of circulation and fragility of my legs. A DVT can lead to stroke or death. I cannot go to the bathroom in the normal way. I must have the assistance of catheters and at least once a day the help of another person.

I suffer constant back pain. It's rather mild but it also never quits. About once every two months I suffer a serious infection of one sort or another. Sometimes it's an infection under a toenail or sometimes it's a urinary tract infection. One such infection was so bad and developed so quickly I was taken to the emergency room and then hospitalized for almost a week.

The single most painful aspect of my condition is the embarrassment and humiliation of not having bowel and bladder control when it leads to an accident in public. There are not words that can describe the sense of absolute shame when this happens and I have to be extraordinarily careful when going to public places. Even the best-laid plans for an accident-free public outing are not always successful.

On the whole I would have to say I'm pretty happy. I have a lovely wife, two beautiful children, parents and extended family who love me deeply. I have been blessed.

I fully support ethical forms of stem cell research. I believe based on news accounts that stem cells could be the key to a full recovery for me. To walk, to regain complete independence, to retake my former strength and good health; I can't tell you how joyous that would be for me and for my family. I can only imagine how many millions of Americans would also benefit.

But, Congressman, I believe there is a very dark side to stem cell research. There are those who believe stem cells should be taken from living embryos. In my opinion the killing of an embryo for the harvest of stem cells is exactly the same as killing another human being. Under no circumstances do I wish to benefit from the stem cells that result from the harming or killing of a human embryo. No thanks, I'll stay in this wheelchair.

There are those who believe stem cells should be taken from aborted embryos. After all they're just going to be discarded anyway. To me that's like saying, well the Nazis did experiments on some of the 6 million Jews. Can't we use their notes and their lab materials to advance scientific and medical knowledge? No, as a matter we cannot do so with a clear conscience.

Nor can we with a clear conscience use embryonic stem cells resulting from the harm or death of a human embryo.

I have no opposition to the use of embryonic stem cells, which are collected in such a way as to cause no harm to an unborn baby (which includes a human embryo or a human fetus). I also have no opposition to the use of adult stem cells.

I fully support ethical research and I know you do too. Thank you for this opportunity to be heard on the record, Congressman Neugebauer. You have been a great friend to the sanctity of human life and for that we all owe you a debt of gratitude.

JAMES CLARK.

□ 1230

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, the only thing shocking about these recent scientific discoveries is they seem to be always revealed right at the same week that we do our embryonic stem cell bill on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I will be pleased to yield 2 minutes to our distinguished caucus Chair, Mr. EMANUEL, from Illinois.

Mr. EMANUEL. I would like to thank my colleague from Colorado. It is interesting she said that. I would like to speak slightly out of order from my prepared text.

The last time we debated stem cell research back in November of 2006, exactly that time there was another discovery about human amniotic fluid basically giving us the fact that we don't need stem cell research.

Past that, and you go back to the period of time in 2005 when we voted on this, the South Korean example was discovered exactly that same day we had that vote.

I used to, growing up, I used to say paranoid people have enemies, too. It is ironic that every time we vote on this legislation, all of a sudden there is a major scientific discovery that basically says you don't have to do stem cell research. The truth is, you don't base your research on one report in a medical journal. You provide leadership.

If you go back to the 1950s, we had a polio epidemic in this country that was killing thousands of people, leaving people terminally paralyzed. With funding from Washington, we found a cure for polio. Politics did not lead the way, medical research led the way, and America led its leadership there. That type of leadership needs to be provided for illnesses of Alzheimer's, Parkinson's disease and other work where we should allow the scientific research and the promise of stem cell research to move forward, rather than allow politics to dictate what we do here.

This is one of those promising areas where, regardless of philosophy or ideology, rather, or party affiliation, when you look at diabetes, Parkinson's disease, Alzheimer's, it affects every family, every community, individuals across this country. There is a promise here, a right way to do it. We can provide the leadership here for our medical research, define illnesses and cures to disease that not only affect our budget, our country, but our capacity to lead in the scientific field in this area.

I would like to thank my colleague, and this Nation should support this legislation. I look forward to finally getting this on the President's desk.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished congresswoman from Cincinnati, Ohio, Congresswoman SCHMIDT.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition of Senate bill 5. This Nation is divided on this issue. Many people believe our tax dollars should not be used when the compromising of a human life is involved. Many people believe embryonic stem cells kill a human life.

The research on embryonic stem cells has not lived up to the hope and promise of its supporters. Other forms have, and these do not compromise a human life. They include cord blood and embryonic fluid, adult stem cells, and just as reported in today's Christian

Science Monitor, artificial stem cells from mice.

Let's use the public's tax dollars in a way that does not compromise our human values. Let's vote "no" on Senate bill 5.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut, another leader on this issue, both in the State House and Congress, Mr. MURPHY.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act.

Two years ago, as Congresswoman DEGETTE noted, I was honored to write and pass one of the Nation's first stem cell investment acts, Connecticut's \$100 million investment in stem cell research. But I decided to seek a seat in this body because our action in Connecticut was ultimately hamstrung by inaction here in Washington, despite public cries for our Federal Government to invest in stem cell research. We could not, in large part not because of the will of this House but because of the will of the President.

What should not be in doubt here today is the promise that this legislation holds. Although new discoveries occur every day, including just yesterday expanding the potential of stem cell research, make no mistake, political lines drawn by this political body about what kind of research will be allowed and will not be allowed will frustrate science and postpone cures. That's why every major medical, science and scientific professional association, as well as major research universities and institutions and affected patient advocacy organizations support the passage of this bill.

Senator ORRIN HATCH from Utah, who has always been a faithful ally of the pro-life community, said that being pro-life is more than just caring for the unborns. It's about caring for the living as well. I couldn't agree more, when we talk about the sanctity of human life, and we all believe that human life is sacred.

We too often neglect the things that we can do to protect and extend the lives of our friends and loved ones who suffer from terminal and debilitating diseases. This bill, perhaps more than anything, is about extending and preserving life. That's a value that we all share.

One hundred million Americans are affected by some kind of life-threatening disease. Somewhere in this vast universe, a cure for their disease exists. I know it. We all know it. Let's stop putting up man-made barriers to finding that cure, a cure for our loved ones.

I stand in strong support of this bill. I commend Ms. DEGETTE for her long-awaited advocacy for this issue.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee from the Keystone State of Pennsylvania, Mr. JOE PITTS.

Mr. PITTS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, another day, another vote on legislation that has no chance of becoming law. Everyone on this floor understands that this bill is destined to be vetoed, and we will sustain that veto if and when the time comes.

But, if nothing else, today's debate is at least an opportunity to educate people on the truth about stem cell research. Supporters of embryo-destroying stem cell research would have you believe that embryonic stem cell research is the only way to go. That just is not true. Not only are there ethical alternatives using adult stem cells but these ethical alternatives are proving to be more effective than the embryo-destroying methods promoted by the bill.

Adult stem cells can be derived from numerous places, including nasal tissue, bone marrow, fatty tissue, umbilical cord blood, even amniotic fluid. These adult stem cells have already produced dozens of laboratory successes and even a handful of FDA-approved therapies for humans. Meanwhile, embryonic stem cell research has yet to produce a single treatment or cure in humans.

You will hear a lot of talk on the other side about how we oppose stem cell research. That's simply not true. I am a supporter of stem cell research. I support the research that actually works, the kind that treats human embryos properly, not like laboratory rats. I support the kind of respect for human life at all stages of development. The kind of stem cell research that I support is adult stem cell research.

There is another thing worth clarifying in the debate. The bill under consideration today is not about legalizing embryonic stem cell research. It's already legal. It can be performed in America by anyone who wants to.

The bill we vote on today is about who is going to pay for it. This bill would have millions of Americans pay for a destructive research that they have fundamental moral objections to.

This bill is flawed. It was flawed the last time we voted on it. It's still flawed today.

I urge all of my colleagues to oppose it.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire as to the time remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Ten minutes.

Ms. DEGETTE. And on the other side, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Fifteen minutes.

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

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I yield 3½ minutes to the former Governor of the first State of our great Nation, the State of Delaware, to the Republican sponsor of this legislation, Mr. CASTLE.

Mr. CASTLE. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding and for all his work on the this issue. I also obviously thank my coauthor and good friend on

this, DIANA DEGETTE, for her tremendous work on it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise, obviously, in strong support of the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act, which ethically expands the current Federal embryonic stem cell research policy.

I think we should make a note, this is a Senate bill we are dealing with now. It's changed from our House bill. While we considered similar legislation before, and we have referred to it, this bill has since been expanded to develop methods of deriving stem cells without destroying a human embryo. That's an addition to what we have considered before.

With this bill we have a real opportunity to make history, to jump-start research, which may lead to treatments and cures for countless diseases, including diabetes, HIV/AIDS, Parkinson's disease, Alzheimer's, ALS, multiple sclerosis and cancer.

There are a number of things being stated here that I consider to be myths, and I would like to try to correct some of these in the brief time that I have.

First, this bill does not expand Federal funding and, in fact, does not contain any funds whatsoever. The expansion in the bill refers to the source of the embryos and the quality of stem cell lines. These stem cells would be developed from embryos that come from IVF clinics, which receive no Federal funding. There would be no Federal funding involved in that whatsoever.

Second, it is important to understand that we are only talking about research on embryos that would otherwise be thrown away as medical waste.

That is a decision which is made by those who created the embryo and whoever was running the IVF clinic before the subject of using them for research was ever brought up. So you are dealing solely with embryos on which the decision has been made to have them eliminated as medical waste, because, simply, they don't want to continue to pay for the storage of the embryo or whatever it may be. So anyone who refers to it as killing needs to understand that's going to happen anyhow. That's a decision that's been made. No stem cell would ever be taken from an embryo that was not destined to be destroyed in any event.

Third, the bill specifically states the embryos must be created for purposes of fertility treatment, and no money may have exchanged hands. We think there should be a greater ethical process in all of this, and all of that is spelled out very carefully in this particular legislation.

Fourth, as to the recent announcement of returning mature cells, perhaps, in the skin to an embryonic state which we have been reading about in the last day or two with respect to mice, we need to point out a couple of things: One, that's mice, not human beings; and there is a vast difference. Another interesting point is that these

would not be eligible for Federal research dollars because they were derived after August 9, 2001.

Fifth is this whole issue of pluripotency and what could be done here. There is the constant argument here that adult stem cells have actually been able to resolve some problems. I am all for that. I am 100 percent for all the medical research which goes on. That's what this is all about.

I believe the embryonic stem cells can extend beyond that. I believe the pluripotency of embryonic stem cells, which is supported by so many scientists in this country, is what can make a difference. You don't see that in the others. I would encourage everybody to follow the medical and scientific institutions who are in support of this.

Just finishing the point with respect to the pluripotency, nothing has been stated with respect to the embryonic and umbilical stem cells, that they do have the same pluripotency, as do to embryonic stem cells, which can develop into any cell as far as your body is concerned.

There are approximately 500 medical and scientific universities throughout the country, and various other individuals and groups, Michael J. Fox and others, who support the stem cell research and ask us to vote in favor of lifting restrictions on potentially lifesaving medical research.

I would encourage a "no" vote on any motion to recommit to restructure the legislation and a "yes" vote on the underlying legislation.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I am now very pleased to yield 2 minutes to another distinguished leader on this issue, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CARNAHAN).

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong support of S. 5, the stem cell research act that we have gotten from the Senate.

This bill, first, I want to say, sets strong ethical standards to be followed that don't exist today. As the gentleman from Delaware stated, these embryos can't be created just for the purposes of research. They can only be produced for the purpose of reproduction and that are unused, that would otherwise be discarded as medical waste. They can only be donated, not sold, and only by the written consent of those involved.

Those are strong ethical standards that don't exist today. We need them to continue this research in an ethical way.

This stem cell research holds real promise to cures of so many diseases. But to unlock the full potential of this research, we must remove the artificial barriers that President Bush put in place to this research and to support the hopes of millions of Americans who work every day to survive under the burden of a life-altering diagnosis.

Nearly every family in this country has been touched. My own family, I had a cousin, Betty, who suffered and suc-

cumbed to MS. My grandmother and sister have suffered from cancer. In my State of Missouri, we took the extraordinary step in 2006 to vote to amend our State constitution to include protections for research and add strong ethical standards for it.

I also became involved in this debate because of the extraordinary men and women from my State, such as advocates like Bernie Frank of St. Louis, attorney and coordinator for the Parkinson's Action Network. He was diagnosed with Parkinson's 13 years ago but has been a fearless advocate. Advocates like Dr. Thy Huskey, assistant professor at the Washington University School of Medicine, she lives with this disease; and we want to continue to support this.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, could I inquire on the time remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. You have 12 minutes. Eight minutes to the gentleman; twelve minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

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

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Congressman from Melbourne, Florida, which is known as the Space Coast and home of Cape Kennedy, Mr. WELDON.

□ 1245

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in opposition to the bill as a physician who practiced medicine for many years prior to coming to the House. And, indeed, I still see patients once a month at the VA clinic in my district.

I always considered it very, very important not only to help my patients with illness but as well to give them hope and to give them real hope and not false hope. And one of the things I've always been concerned about in this debate for the last 7 or 8 years since we've been conducting this debate is that the advocates for more funding, Federal funding, for embryonic stem cell research; and we are funding embryonic stem cell research, we're just not funding more research that involves destruction of human embryos; have been contending, the advocates of this have been contending for years that this has the greatest potential. And in reality, there are no phase 1 clinical trials with embryonic stem cell research. There are no phase 2 clinical trials. There are no phase 3 clinical trials. Embryonic stem cells have never moved beyond animal research because embryonic stem cells have never been shown to be safe.

Embryonic stem cells form tumors when you put them in animals, whereas adult stem cells, cord blood stem cells, not only have been shown to be safe, but they're in phase 1, phase 2 and phase 3 clinical trials. They are in clinical trials in heart disease, I think about 28 clinical trials, FDA-approved clinical trials. They're in clinical trials

on treating a whole host of blood-borne diseases. And just very recently we saw published research, amazing research in phase 1 diabetes, juvenile diabetes research.

Indeed, I've been saying for years that medical science is going to move beyond this debate. And we saw a preview of that today published, that skin cells can be converted, possibly, back to forming embryonic-like cells. Science is going to move beyond this discussion. I don't think, being that millions of Americans believe in the sanctity of human life, that we should be funding research involving the destruction of human life.

Ms. DEGETTE. I'll continue to reserve, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Congressman from the Peach State of Georgia, Dr. GINGREY.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to S. 5, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act. And I do so, not because I oppose embryonic stem cell research, but because, as an OB/GYN physician, I oppose federally funded embryonic stem cell research that destroys human life. And the truth of the matter is, I am not alone in this belief, Mr. Speaker. In fact, I'm joined by nearly half the American public. Let me say that again: Nearly half of the American public opposes using taxpayers' dollars to fund embryonic stem cell research when a human embryo is destroyed in the process.

Now, I know that the supporters of this bill claim an overwhelming majority of Americans wholeheartedly endorse their bill. However, when these same Americans are asked specifically whether or not they would like the Federal Government to fund research that destroys a human embryo, the survey results refute that claim. In fact, over 60 percent, Mr. Speaker, of Americans do not support their money going towards destructive embryonic stem cell research.

Mr. Speaker, it's not the job of Congress to force the American taxpayers to fund research that they morally oppose. Rather, this body is charged with the awesome responsibility of being good stewards of the taxpayer dollar by supporting research that upholds the values of our society. And I want to remind my colleagues and the American people, today that is the question we're debating. We are debating whether or not American taxpayers should be forced to pay for research that destroys human life. Contrary to what we're hearing today, we are not debating whether or not embryonic stem cell research is legal in this country; because not only is it completely legal, but it is also well funded in both the private and public sectors. In fact, Mr. Speaker, between State governments and private sector, nearly \$4 billion has been committed to embryonic stem cell research over the next 10 years.

So, Mr. Speaker, as a society that has always valued and protected the

fragility of human life, we must reject this misguided attempt to force the American people into paying for something with which they fundamentally disagree. And I encourage my colleagues, oppose this bill.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, if you did the math, 64 percent support embryonic stem cell research, so that's well in excess of a majority.

I am now pleased to recognize another leader, both at the State level and Federal level, in this, Mr. MITCHELL from Arizona, for 1½ minutes.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congresswoman DEGETTE for her leadership in this area.

Congress rarely gets an opportunity to do what it can do today, offer hope to millions of Americans who suffer from diseases such as Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, Lou Gehrig's and Huntington's disease.

As I have said many times, I believe the best way we can honor life is by investing in science and ethical research.

A growing majority of the American people, including my constituents in Arizona's Fifth Congressional District believe this is an investment that we should make, and they were proud when, last January, 253 Members of the House voted to support the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act.

The American people support this research because they understand that we have a moral obligation to invest in embryonic stem cell research because it provides the best hope for a cure for these diseases and many others. They know we're already seeing progress in this field.

Just last month, scientists used embryonic stem cells to create insulin-producing cells that could one day lead to a cure for diabetes. Just imagine what we could do with a more serious commitment to stem cell research. The American people are watching us today, and the millions of Americans who could be helped by passing this legislation are depending on us today. Let us do the right thing and pass this legislation.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Lincoln, Nebraska, home of the world famous Nebraska Cornhuskers, Mr. FORTENBERRY.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I support stem cell research. I support stem cell research using umbilical cord blood cells, adult stem cell sources, amniotic fluid stem cells and now, as we have learned, a new source of stem cells, skin cells, all stem cell sources that are showing real medical process and avoid the ethically divisive issue of the destruction of unborn human embryos, unborn human persons.

Mr. Speaker, let's do what's right. Let's use our scarce resources for what makes sense and not force taxpayers to pay for questionable research that offends the sensibilities of so many Americans and has yet to show any real therapeutic productivity.

Research using adult stem cells, including umbilical cord blood and bone

marrow sources has shown great promise and provided real clinical benefits to numerous patients suffering from approximately 72 diseases. Adult stem cells are providing genuine evidence-based hope for the potential cures for the ravages of Parkinson's, spinal cord injuries and even diabetes. We also know now that stem cells derived from amniotic fluid have allowed researchers in Europe to begin growing heart valves for pre-born infants diagnosed in utero with heart disease. Unlike embryonic stem cells, adult and amniotic sources have not been shown to form tumors in laboratory animals.

Mr. Speaker, all of these facts beg a central question: Why are we even considering expanding the use of Federal dollars to fund the ethically divisive and currently unproductive practice of embryonic stem cell research when so many viable and proven alternatives exist? It's not fair. It's not fair to those who are suffering from the ravages of disease. Why would we be willing in Congress to trade false hope for real hope?

We should oppose this measure. And I believe we should invest in proven stem cell research.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to yield to the very distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HARE) 1½ minutes.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank my colleague and friend, Congresswoman DEGETTE, for introducing the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act and for her leadership on this important issue.

As many of you know, I came to this Congress with a bittersweet victory. And although I'm deeply honored to be a new Member of this House and represent the 17th Congressional District of Illinois, part of me is sad that my friend and my mentor, Congressman Lane Evans, is not here in my place. Lane served as a distinguished Member of this body for over 24 years until Parkinson's forced him to retire at the end of the 109th Congress, cutting his exceptional service short. Lane is just one of millions of Americans struggling with chronic illnesses that are curable with the advancement of stem cell research.

Spencer House, the son of my very good friend, Doug House, suffers from juvenile diabetes and must take four insulin shots each and every day. But Doug is encouraged with the hope that embryonic stem cell research will some day offer his son a more normal life. And he's not alone. Poll after poll shows that a majority of Americans support ethical embryonic stem cell research as a way to prevent others from having to live with illnesses like Parkinson's disease, cancer, Alzheimer's and spinal cord injuries.

Mr. Speaker, today we decide whether to give the American people hope or to continue to prolong the suffering of those who struggle with curable chronic diseases. It's time to put the people above politics by providing millions of

Americans with the hope of a better day, and we will do that this day by passing this important legislation.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Mr. JEB HENSARLING, who is a graduate of that great university in our home State, Texas A&M, the fighting Texas Aggies.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I certainly understand the passion behind this debate, for I, too, have friends and loved ones who have been stricken with debilitating diseases who are longing for hope.

But in listening to the debate, Mr. Speaker, I fear not one in 100 understand what it is truly about. This is not a debate on whether stem cell research is legal in America. It is. It's not even a debate on whether or not embryonic stem cell research is legal in America. It is. It is not even a debate on whether the Federal Government will be permitted to fund embryonic stem cell research. It does, to the tune of roughly \$40 million a year.

What this debate is about, Mr. Speaker, is whether or not, going forward, should taxpayer funds be used to destroy what many consider to be human life for research purposes. And this is especially, especially highlighted when we know that there are ethical alternatives and promising alternatives, such as adult stem cells, umbilical blood cord, amniotic fluid and, today, headlines, banner headlines all around the Nation about the promise now of skin cells. Let's fund stem cell research, but let's fund it ethically. And, Mr. Speaker, when this body takes on such profound issues, let's always err on the side of life.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I am now delighted to yield 1 minute to the distinguished majority leader, Mr. HOYER.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady, and I congratulate the gentlelady for the extraordinary work she has done, not just this year but throughout the years on this very, very important issue which offers hope for literally millions and millions of people, not just in America but throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, again, today the new majority in this House demonstrates its commitment, its commitment to addressing the priorities of the American people. As we consider this legislation, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act of 2007, let us be clear: This bill, S. 5, has widespread bipartisan support in Congress and certainly among the American people. It passed the Senate in April by a vote of 63-34. And it's nearly identical to legislation the House passed in January by a bipartisan substantial margin of 253-174.

This legislation will pass again today. And thus the real question is will the President heed the will of the

American people as expressed by bipartisan majorities in both Houses of Congress and sign this bill.

□ 1300

Or will the President continue to undermine the will of the American people.

In short, Mr. Speaker, this legislation would increase the number of embryonic stem cell lines eligible for federally funded research. Current policy limits the use of Federal funds for research only to those stem cell lines that existed when President Bush issued an executive order of August 9, 2001, an executive order which accommodated the research we are talking about but limited it.

This policy severely restricts the potential for lifesaving breakthroughs because only 22 of those 78 stem cell lines are available for research today; and the vast majority of those 22 lines are aged, contaminated, or have been developed through obsolete methods.

It cannot be stressed enough: This legislation only authorizes Federal research funds for stem cell lines generated from the embryos that would otherwise be discarded by fertility clinics. Thus, this legislation does not seek nor does it certainly intend to destroy life. It seeks to preserve life.

Former Senate majority leader Dr. Bill Frist, who was once an opponent of efforts like this one but now supports them, stated: "I strongly believe . . . that embryonic stem cells uniquely hold specific promise for some therapies and potential cures that adult stem cells cannot provide." That was Dr. Frist, the former Republican majority leader of the United States Senate.

Mr. Speaker, we have, I think, a moral obligation to provide our scientific community with the tools it needs to save lives, and this legislation accomplishes that objective.

Supporters of this bill understand that there is a difficult issue for many Americans and that it raises many questions that humanity has yet to adequately answer, and that is why this legislation also directs HHS and the National Institutes of Health to issue ethical guidelines that will ensure the highest standards of scientific investigation. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, this bill directs the Secretary of Health and Human Services to conduct and support research on stem cells not derived from human embryos.

The truth is, as demonstrated by Gallup polls taken since 2001, the more Americans learn about the potential for stem cell research, the more they support it. Just last month, 65 percent of Americans reported that they supported expanding Federal funding for stem cell research. This legislation represents the hope of millions of Americans who are waiting for us to take action.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bill, as they have before. It is an opportunity. It is a chance. It is a

hope for better health and life for those whom we represent.

I urge the President to reconsider his veto when this bipartisan piece of legislation reaches his desk, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield for the purposes of making a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill.

Mr. Speaker, proponents of embryonic stem cells state the greatest advantage is the "pluripotency" of these cells, cells with the amazing ability to grow into any type of cell in the human body. It is this unique adaptability that they claim makes embryonic stem cells more promising than adult stem cells for treatment of human diseases. The truth however, is that embryonic stem cells have not produced a single viable human treatment for any disease; whereas, adult stem cells have produced numerous therapies that have been successfully administered.

Adult stem cells have provided human treatments, have a lower rate of immune rejection in patients, and show less likelihood of tumor formation. We should aggressively pursue this avenue of research. In seeking new treatments for the ills of humanity, let us also strive to protect the future of humanity. We too must uphold the first tenet of the Hippocratic oath—"First do no harm."

Proponents also claim that the U.S. is lagging behind the rest of the world in embryonic stem cell research and that increased Federal funding would close the gap. The fact is the United States leads the world in embryonic stem cell research. A recent Nature Journal publication states that U.S. scientists contributed 46 percent of all stem cell publications since 1998. Germany comes far second, representing 10 percent of studies, and the remaining 44 percent derive from between 16 other countries.

I want to remind my colleagues that the current ban on embryonic research does not prevent private funding for embryonic stem cell research. Microsoft Chairman Bill Gates and Newport Beach bond trader Bill Gross are among several private donors who have provided millions of dollars toward embryonic stem cell research. In fact the Federal Government has spent over \$161 million on existing stem cell lines where the embryo had already been destroyed. The bill before us today advocates the further destruction of new life to expand human embryonic stem cell research. I urge my colleagues to vote against this legislation and do no harm.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 1½ minutes to another member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, from Williamson County, Tennessee, Congresswoman MARSHA BLACKBURN, a close personal friend of the Country Hall of Fame music legend Eddie Arnold.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

The distinguished majority leader just mentioned that it is a debate about life, and, indeed, this is a debate

about substance, Mr. Speaker, and it is also a debate about life, clear and simple, and protecting life. Because this bill would divert funds from promising leads of adult stem cell research that have shown large benefits, even one of those of being a cure for Type I diabetes, something that we hear about and there has been tremendous research on. It has shown remarkable promise, and this is a great example, in using immature brain cells and eyelet cells from living donors to develop the insulin-producing eyelet cells that are found lacking in people with diabetes. And by using these from living donors or adult brain cells, instead of embryos, science now has the potential to cure diabetes. It is a great example and lesson for us as we talk about the research that is going on with cord blood, with adult stem cells, and now we are learning with skin cells, producing results.

Let's not stop funding this research in order to chase after something else. Let's continue to do productive, results-producing research on which we all agree. And, as we do this, let's protect the sanctity of human life and not cheapen our efforts by disrespecting that life.

I urge my colleagues to vote against Senate bill 5.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I am now very pleased to yield to 1 minute to my colleague from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER), a real leader on this issue.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that holds promise for millions and millions of people across the country. We have heard from some of our friends who oppose this, and they have been very clinical in their descriptions.

I am a father of a daughter with a chronic illness of epilepsy, and this is the kind of research that will help my daughter not to have any more seizures. It is a potential. It is a possibility. And every father, every brother, every mother, every sister, every friend in this room wants to have hope for their friends and their family.

I want to compliment Ms. DEGETTE from Colorado, Mr. CASTLE from Delaware for giving my family hope, for providing this kind of promise. This legislature, this Congress can make a difference in millions of people's lives.

I ask that you all vote for this bill. This is a great bill, and I call on the President to show that he is a compassionate conservative and that he sign this bill.

Ms. DEGETTE. Could I inquire of the Speaker how much time is left on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado has 3½ minutes and the gentleman from Texas has 3 minutes.

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

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the first thing I want to do is I want to thank MIKE CASTLE, my

friend, my compadre, and my fellow journeyman on this journey. We will win this. We will win.

I also want to thank my friend JOE BARTON, who has helped so much not just in this session of Congress but in the past, and all of my leadership on my side who continue to fight for this bill.

Our constituents sent us down here to do the people's work, and they want us to do it in a bipartisan way. This is the best example I can think of in the 10 years that I have been in Congress.

I just want to talk about a few of the misconceptions that have been raised today. The first one is the allegation that the American people do not support stem cell research. This is patently untrue. A new Gallup poll this week shows an increase of 12 percent of Americans that support this research in the last 5 years to 64 percent. Another recent poll showed that when it was explained to them that these embryos are slated to be destroyed but they could be donated for hope that 51 percent of self-described pro-life Republicans support this research.

There is a national consensus. There is a strong majority in the House and the Senate, and there is one thing stopping that, and that is a stubborn President. President Bush needs to understand it is ethical and it is the right thing to do.

Our opponents try to muddle this issue by saying that adult stem cells will be a substitute. This is also patently false. It is amazing that there is new research every time that we come up with this bill, but we welcome that research. We welcome all research. But it is not a substitute for embryonic stem cell research.

In fact, this recent study this week with the mouse cells, the scientists said success with mouse cells does not guarantee quick success with human cells. They called on Congress to pass the bill which would give federally funded researchers access to embryos slated for destruction at fertility clinics. These types of research are years away. Embryonic stem cell research has only been in existence for 7 or 8 years. But 1,300 scientists are sending a letter to President Bush today telling him that this is the research that shows promise, and 80 Nobel Laureates have endorsed the bill. The scientists say that embryonic stem cell research has promise in and of itself and that adult stem cell research, including amniotic research, cord blood, mouse cells, all of these cells are not a substitute.

Mr. CASTLE and I and all of our allies support all of these types of research, but it is not a substitute. But that is also why S. 5 has a provision that supports these.

Vote for hope. Vote for research. Vote for this bill.

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

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

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we have had this debate before, so I am going to refer people to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the appropriate place for my basic remarks on the underlying issue. I simply want to clarify why we are having this particular debate today.

We passed this early in this Congress, this particular piece of legislation. It passed the Senate, and it went to the President, and the President vetoed the bill. Many of those who support embryonic stem cell research think that we ought to be able to find a little finer middle ground, that we might yet get the President to support a version of the bill. So the sponsors, Mr. CASTLE and Ms. DEGETTE, have added the Senate language from the last Congress that Mr. SPECTER and Mr. Santorum passed as a stand-alone bill that I think passed the other body 100-0, which is a very strong vote. It has been added to this bill.

I might add that, apparently, the motion to recommit is going to be something like that language that Mr. GINGREY has offered to the motion to recommit.

So what we are trying to do here today is slice the cheese a little bit finer so that those in the pro-life community like myself who have a 100 percent pro-life voting record, over 23 years except for this one vote, can vote for it, those that believe that we should fund a broader array of embryonic stem cell research can vote for it, and the President can accept it. That is what this particular bill is all about.

I plan to vote for it. I plan to vote against the motion to recommit not because I am opposed to the policy on the motion to recommit, but if we were to accept the motion to recommit, that would send the bill back to the Energy and Commerce Committee and require further consideration, which may or may not result in the bill's coming back to the floor.

So Members have voted on this in this body this year already once. Those of us that served in the last Congress got to vote on it in the last Congress. So there are not too many undecideds. But we are hoping the addition of this Specter-Santorum language, which is also sponsored in the House by Mr. BARTLETT and Mr. GINGREY, will result in a little bit finer slice of the cheese, that we will yet get a bill through the House and through the Senate that the President will accept. So that is what this is about.

I would urge a "yes" vote on the bill and a "no" vote on the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, stem cell legislation has been well debated on this floor, and I support it. This bill has again been brought to the floor with no committee process. When I was chairman we handled this important issue with full consultation with our minority. That is the preferable way to legislate.

This bill is designed to create enough lines of embryonic stem cells to allow basic scientific research to move forward. Most of the

scientific community has articulated 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.

For numerous reasons, not all of the potential stem cell lines that were thought to be available for research when the President announced his policy in August 2001 are actually viable for research purposes. The number of stem cell lines available for scientific research is actually well below the estimated number of stem cell lines that were thought to exist in August of 2001.

We will also eventually need additional embryonic stem cell lines to make further scientific advances. 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.

Understandably, this is not a simple vote for anyone on this floor. There is no ideological cloak under which we can take cover. This is a vote of conscience for all members. In the 109th Congress, similar legislation was agreed to by a vote of 238 to 194 in the House and later passed the Senate by a vote of 63 to 37.

S. 5 before us today is actually an improvement over previous iterations of legislation on this issue. I strongly support the additional language that will examine methods of obtaining stem cells from alternative sources. I believe in this area we should be looking at different options that can lead to the medical breakthroughs necessary to save lives.

My position as an ardent supporter of the need to defend human life has never wavered. As my record will dictate, I have been opposed to all forms of abortion. I extend this principle to respecting the need for scientific research to protect and improve existing human lives. My decision to support this legislation is the product of much personal contemplation.

I would urge my colleagues to understand the great thought that goes into a vote of this nature and ask that we respect one another and their beliefs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1315

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I am now honored to recognize the Speaker of the House for our remaining time.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentle lady from California for yielding time and for her exceptional leadership.

Every family in America who has concern about the health and well-being of moms and dads, grandparents and children, brothers and sisters owes a deep debt of gratitude to DIANA DEGETTE. With her stewardship of this bill, she has given us an opportunity to give hope to these many families across our country.

Every one of those families in America, every one of us is one telephone call or one diagnosis away from needing the benefits of stem cell research. I can't help but think that even those who are against this legislation today would want their family members, their child with diabetes, their husband with Parkinson's, their father with

Alzheimer's, their mother with breast cancer, to have the benefit of stem cell research.

Science is a gift of God to all of us. And science has taken us to a place that is Biblical in its power to cure, and that is the embryonic stem cell research.

Congresswoman DEGETTE not only worked on this legislation on its substance, she was generous with her personal experience to demonstrate the need for the bill. She understood that this legislation had to be bipartisan. And I commend Congressman MIKE CASTLE of Delaware for his exceptional and courageous leadership on this legislation as well.

Today, we continue the debate. As Mr. BARTON said, we've had this debate before. In fact, bipartisan majorities in both Houses of Congress have passed similar legislation before. Yet with his cruel veto pen, President Bush dashed the hopes of many for the healing potential of stem cell research. Today, we, along with millions of Americans, are hoping for a different outcome. Because every family in America, again, is just one diagnosis, one phone call or one accident away from needing the benefits of embryonic stem cell, we hope the President will consider his position.

Mr. Speaker, this week I am observing 20 years in the Congress of the United States. I am proud of that. But I mention it here because this is one of the most glorious days, in the top five for sure, that I have experienced here. With the introduction of this legislation again, with its passage, which I think will be clear and bipartisan, we are doing something that is relevant to the lives of the American people. And we are doing something that gives people hope. With this legislation, we have the opportunity to save lives, find cures and, again, give hope to those suffering. It is an opportunity that neither we nor the President should miss.

This legislation, as has been mentioned, would allow American scientists to pursue the science they believe has the most promise to cure. It would bring embryonic stem cell research under the strict controls and ethical guidelines of the National Institutes of Health. That doesn't exist now. Why would we reject that? And it would help ensure our Nation remains pre-eminent in science.

There is every compassionate reason and scientific reason to support stem cell research. But why would we send this promising science offshore? Why would we allow other countries to attract the best scientists with the best facilities and the best public support? If that excellence leaves us, we are not the best. That is completely unacceptable to Americans. I am so proud of my own State of California, where we have taken action on the ballot to establish the research in our own State, but it should be available to the entire country.

According to scientists, including many Nobel Laureates, embryonic

stem cell research could unlock the doors to treatments and cures to cancer, diabetes, Alzheimer's disease, Parkinson's, multiple sclerosis and many, many more diseases. If we have a scientific opportunity to treat and cure disease, we have a moral responsibility to support it.

Through stem cell research, this bill has the potential to bring hope and health to millions. I hope the President will sign it. It has support in Congress, and in the country, 72 percent of Americans support this bipartisan bill. That is a remarkable number for a remarkable bill. Our Nation's scientists support this bill. Our finest research institutes support this bill. And many religious organizations support this bill. In fact, many religious leaders endorse this bill because of its respect of life, and they believe that science has the Biblical power to cure. As the Episcopal Church writes in its letter in support of this legislation, "As stewards of creation, we are called to help men and renew the world in many ways. Medical research expands our knowledge of God's creation and empowers us to bring potential healing to those who suffer."

Thank you, Congresswoman DEGETTE and Congressman CASTLE, for giving us the opportunity to support that science and honor that moral responsibility.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act of 2007. This bill would give new hope to millions of Americans with debilitating illnesses such as Parkinson's, Alzheimer's, and cancer, and would do so under an ethically stringent framework. We owe it to our citizens living in pain to find cures for these terrible afflictions, and enable them to live out long, healthy lives. While I am aware of the ethical questions raised by stem cell research, I believe it represents one of the most promising medical opportunities in human history.

Unfortunately, research on embryonic cells is stagnating because it is currently restricted to the 78 stem cell lines that NIB held before August 9, 2001. Of those 78 lines, only 22 were in good enough condition to be used: Most lines were contaminated by mouse feeder cells and could have been deadly if transplanted into people. In order to make new progress in stem cell research, there is a dire need for researchers to have access to lines that are new and uncontaminated.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the bill before us would be a strong step toward reclaiming our status as the world's scientific leader and finding cures for millions of Americans suffering from debilitating and often fatal diseases. We must support our medical and scientific communities in their efforts to extend and enhance human life. Doing anything less is a disservice to our country and our citizens.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3, Expanding Stem Cell Research.

During the recorded vote on this important bill, I was required to be back in my home district to assist my mother, who is having surgery.

I believe stem cell research holds enormous promise for easing human suffering. Embry-

onic stem cell research could lead to cures that could dramatically improve lives. However, it is important to note that while I disagree with the creation of human embryos for scientific purposes, I agree that embryos created as a by-product of in vitro fertilization, which would otherwise be destroyed, should be allowed to provide greater insight into the myriad afflictions that can potentially be alleviated through stem cell research.

As with all scientific endeavors, we must ensure that the limitless bounds of science do not infringe on the beliefs that we hold as ethical human beings. For this reason, I categorically oppose the harvesting of embryos for scientific research as well as any attempt to use our scientific knowledge to clone human beings.

I would like the RECORD to reflect that I have been and will continue to be supportive of Stem Cell Research and that I would have voted yea had I been present. Federal support is critical to its success which is why I will continue to support ethical Stem Cell Research.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of Federal funding for stem cell research. Gravely ill Americans are asking their government for help, but President Bush's so-called "moral" reservations could again stand in the way of advances in medical science and deny people potentially life-saving cures.

I find it ludicrous that the same administration that has submerged the country in a nonsensical and deadly war professes that to make use of stem cells to develop cures is "morally troubling." The President's backwards approach to what he considers progress would be laughable were the consequences of his decisions not so spectacularly detrimental to our country's welfare.

What is morally troubling is that Americans who are suffering from Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, cancer, and other deadly diseases cannot place hope in what is becoming an increasingly important field of research. It is morally troubling that friends and family who have suffered the loss of loved ones to painful and drawn-out illnesses cannot depend on our country's leaders to pursue what could be an effective form of disease prevention.

Instead of throwing away some 400,000 frozen embryos left over from in vitro fertilization procedures, we should use stem cells from these embryos to better the lives of countless individuals.

I urge my colleagues to soundly reject this phony "culture of life" and instead support H.R. 3 which promotes and prolongs life. I hope the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act passes with enough support to overcome a likely presidential veto.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of S. 5, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act of 2007. 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. I am pleased the 110th Congress has taken immediate steps to address this important issue, and it is my hope that members will once again unite in support of this bill.

Biologists, medical experts, and the vast majority of Americans agree there is a reservoir of discovery in embryonic stem cell research that offers hope for over 100 million

Americans afflicted with life-threatening and debilitating diseases. The Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act allows this critical research to move forward in an ethical way by expanding the number of stem cell lines readily available to scientists, while implementing strong ethical guidelines to ensure federal oversight of the research. 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 researchers.

We are already at risk of losing our scientific and technological edge because of increasing competition around the world. As a Nation of opportunity and innovation, we have a responsibility to embrace policies that create breakthroughs in both medicine and technology for the benefit of our citizens.

From its earliest days, The University of Wisconsin-Madison has been one of the leading facilities for stem cell research, and I believe with continued study, the possible medical benefits of stem cell research are limitless; lives affected by diseases, damaged tissue, and faulty organs would be greatly improved. Additionally, this legislation would ensure the important work of our scientists is not unnecessarily sidetracked by politics.

The significance of this legislation extends beyond the potential for advances in science and technology. More importantly, embryonic stem cell research could lead to new treatments and cures for the over 100 million 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. From the study of human development to the discovery of life-saving cures, there are just too many potential benefits to allow Federal policy to roadblock the continuation of this groundbreaking research that holds promise and hope for so many lives. Thus, I strongly urge my colleagues to respond to the interests and needs of our Nation's citizens. Please join me in supporting this important legislation that will reinvigorate embryonic stem cell research in this country and allow science to move forward unimpeded, revolutionize the practice of medicine, and offer hope to the millions of Americans suffering from debilitating diseases.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 5, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act which is the latest endeavor by this Congress to pass meaningful legislation that will impact the lives of millions of people suffering from a myriad of diseases.

S. 5 would expand the Federal funding of embryonic stem cell research by lifting the restrictions on the embryonic stem cell lines that can be used for Federally-funded research—restrictions that were imposed by President Bush in 2001. Most of the stem cell lines authorized for Federally-funded research under the President's policy are now no longer useful for research. However, the bill only authorizes Federal research funds for stem cell lines generated from embryos that would otherwise be discarded by fertility clinics. S. 5 also creates an ethical framework that must be followed in conducting this research under the guidance of the National Institutes of Health.

This body has voted in favor of expanding the number of stem cell lines eligible for Federal funding with strict ethical guidelines twice in the past year. I believe it is time for the president to listen to the overwhelming support from Congress and more importantly, from the majority of Americans, who want science to prevail and cures to be found with the promise of embryonic stem cell research.

If Federally funded, this research could help nearly 100 million Americans suffering from cancer, Alzheimer's disease, diabetes, Parkinson's disease, spinal cord injuries, heart disease, ALS, and other devastating conditions. Put simply, embryonic stem cell research offers the greatest promise for developing treatments and cures.

Today, there are only 21 embryonic stem cell lines that are available to Federally funded scientists. This is a number that scientists confirm is insufficient and is negatively impacting medical advances in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I must repeat myself on this issue because it cannot be said enough times: this bill is about saving lives and preventing devastating diseases from ravaging and ending people's lives. As a founder and current co-chair of the Bicameral Congressional Caucus on Parkinson's Disease and as someone who lost my father to Parkinson's disease, I know firsthand just how important this legislation is and how important it is to open up the stem cell lines.

I stand with a bipartisan majority of Congress and urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this critical legislation.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I support S. 5, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act, because it is a critical advancement in scientific research. The medical possibilities from stem cells continue to excite the scientific community, holding great promise for therapies to alleviate human suffering from diseases such as diabetes, Parkinson's, Alzheimer's, multiple sclerosis, and cancer. Perhaps no area provides more potential to revolutionize the lives of Americans than the ability to avoid or cure debilitating diseases. It is time for the Federal government to be a full partner in the critical advancement of stem cell research.

This legislation enables scientists to pursue research in a responsible, ethical manner, through the utilization of the 400,000 surplus embryos currently frozen in storage at fertilization clinics across the U.S. The strict confines of this legislation present no threat to the sanctity of human life. I strongly concur with the National Institute for Health Director's statement that it is in the best interests of our scientists, our science, and our country to pursue all aspects of stem cell research—both adult and embryonic—to the fullest extent.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act—a smart, thoughtful and, more important, ethical piece of legislation that already has passed in the House. This bill will expand needed Federal funding to ensure that the promises of embryonic stem cell research finally become reality in this nation.

For the millions of Americans who suffer from the very conditions for which stem cell research could hold a cure, the time has come for us to do more than just offer hope. The time is now for us to find and offer cures to some of the most devastating conditions and

diseases that detrimentally affect more than 100 million Americans and their families.

Mr. Speaker, this bill also will send a long overdue message to our friends in the global community: that we are re-assuming our place at the helm of the world's forward-thinking, inspirational and smart health lawmakers.

As a physician, I have seen what happens to people afflicted with diseases and conditions, like Alzheimer's, sickle cell anemia and Parkinson's, and I have seen the impact it has on their families, friends and loved ones. And, it sickens me to know that a promising public health advancement is being tainted by some of my colleagues who wrongfully and unethically applying a theological argument to this issue. Mr. Speaker, this is not a faith issue; this should not be a partisan issue; it's a public health issue and an American issue.

Imagine an America free of Parkinson's disease, Alzheimer's, sickle cell anemia and multiple sclerosis; spinal cord injuries, cancer and diabetes. I call on the President to sign the bill into law and to be a part of the solution—and not the problem. The time simply is now.

Mr. SHAY. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Colorado and the gentleman from Delaware 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 27. 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, and it is only 8 years old. These are discarded embryos that were never in the womb that can help save lives.

This is not a matter of pro-life versus pro-choice, but rather, it is a matter of man and womankind versus disease. I am happy this legislation has once again passed the House and Senate and will head to the President, and I pray the President reconsiders his position on this vital issue and 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.

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.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer my support for passage of S. 5, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act of 2007. The scientific community has demonstrated the great potential for stem cell research. Advancements are being made through the National Institute of Health, private sector biotechnology, and research universities.

Some of that progress has been made with stem cells from other than embryonic sources, but the Congress should not be in the business of shackling scientific discovery and should pass this legislation to open up the potential that embryonic stem cell research has to offer. In Orange County, California, the University of California at Irvine, Reeve Research Center is home to spectacular research that is utilizing embryonic stem cells to develop treatments for spinal-cord injuries and neurological disorders.

California has already led the way for responsible government support of stem cell research. Now is the time for the Federal government to do so as well. I urge my colleagues to support the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my opposition to S. 5, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act. Like H.R. 3, which we considered earlier this year, and H.R. 810, S. 5 would use taxpayer funds to destroy human life.

Some of my colleagues claim that embryonic stem cell research is essential to finding cures to a range of diseases. This could not be further from the truth. On top of the fact that embryo-derived treatments have been fraught with problems, including the widespread occurrence of tumor formation, there is now a host of increasingly more successful alternative treatments that offer tangible results to suffering Americans and their families.

Research has demonstrated that various forms of adult stem cell materials, umbilical cord blood and amniotic fluid are an excellent source of pluripotent stem cells. These materials have yielded highly successful, groundbreaking treatments for Brain Cancer, Breast Cancer, various forms of Lymphoma and Leukemia, Multiple Sclerosis, Parkinson's Disease, spinal cord injury, Sickle Cell Anemia and Krabbe Disease. Treatments employing umbilical cord blood have been particularly successful and the list goes on and on. Just recently, a new study by American and Brazilian researchers published in the *Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA)* demonstrated the use of stem cells taken from 13 patient's own bodies to reverse the symptoms of Juvenile Diabetes. These patients have been able to live so far without insulin some as long as three years. Just this morning, the Associated Press reported a new report from three independent teams of scientists that have been able to produce the practical equivalent of embryonic stem cells in mice without destroying any embryos. Thus far, ethical forms of stem cell research have yielded treatments for over 73 different diseases while well-funded embryonic research has thus far only yielded tumors.

Mr. Speaker, every time my colleagues in the house trumpet the necessity of destroying embryos, scientific studies come along to

prove them wrong on point after point. Rather than forcing taxpayers to fund the destruction of human life, we should be putting our resources into the types of ethical research that are rapidly providing the treatments that Americans so greatly desire.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, today, the House will again pass legislation to support humane and potentially life-saving embryonic stem cell research. I am a cosponsor of this essential legislation to increase the number of embryonic stem cell lines that can be used to conduct federally funded research to search for cures for a number of diseases such as diabetes, Parkinson's disease, Alzheimer's, ALS, multiple sclerosis, and cancer.

The opponents of this legislation say that we should pursue alternative avenues for research, such as adult stem cells, cord blood cells, and amniotic fluid cells. And they are correct; we should investigate each one of them. Yet, that is not a compelling reason to block researchers from pursuing embryonic stem cell research, which experts agree holds the greatest potential because of the pluripotent nature of the cells.

As a research scientist, I understand that we will only understand the true value of each of these cell types when the research is done. That is why it is essential that we pass this bill and make more embryonic stem cell lines available for exploration.

My home state of New Jersey has demonstrated real national leadership on stem cell research. In 2005, New Jersey became the first state in the nation to award public funds for research on human embryonic stem cells. Just last month, Governor Corzine pledged an additional \$10 million in public funds for stem cell research. And the state legislature recently approved \$270 million for new stem cell research centers. New Jersey is taking the lead on this ground breaking research, but that can not be an excuse for inaction on the federal level.

It would be immoral for the federal government not to pursue this promising avenue of research, which holds the potential to revolutionize medical care for those afflicted with tragic diseases and conditions.

I implore President Bush to put his veto pen away—he must stop standing in the way of scientific progress that could benefit all Americans.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act of 2007. We can never guarantee the results of scientific research, but without it we can guarantee that there will be no results.

From juvenile diabetes, Alzheimer's and Parkinson's disease to Multiple Sclerosis and cancer, stem cell research has the potential to begin to uncover cures for the diseases that affect our constituents and our families. In the debate over fixing our broken health care system in America, we cannot afford to ignore the medical breakthroughs in disease management that stem cell research has the potential to uncover.

Some opponents of this legislation argue that the federal government already significantly funds stem cell research or that private entities will step in to take up the slack. The reality is that stem cell research is practically at a standstill in this country today. Of the 78 stem cell lines currently permitted under federally funded research, 57 are contaminated and are thus incapable of producing such break-

throughs. Research has been stifled under the Administration's stem cell policy.

This morning's news highlights a recent scientific paper written by scientists that have manipulated an ordinary mouse skin cell into what may be effectively an embryonic stem cell. More research must be done to see if scientists can coax human skin cells to have the same qualities as embryonic stem cells; however, as advocate Sean Tipton told the *Washington Post* this morning, "You cannot make good policy one scientific paper at a time." The bill before us today encourages further research on isolating and testing non-embryonic cells and at the same time lifts the ban on federal support of embryonic stem cell research.

The Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act is a well-crafted, bipartisan approach. The bill only allows the use of stem cell lines generated from embryos that would otherwise be discarded by fertility clinics. The legislation contains strict ethical guidelines, including the requirement that embryos can be used only if the donor give their written consent and receive no money or other inducement in exchange.

The President vetoed very similar legislation last year, and there is little doubt that he will veto it again. The medical research that embryonic stem cell lines offer is crucial for millions of people dealing with incurable and debilitating diseases. It is an insufficient response for Congress to simply accept the Bush Administration's intransigence on this issue. The legislation before us is a bipartisan bill that strong majorities of the House and Senate support. Further, it is clear that a broad majority of Americans support responsible embryonic stem cell research. The real question today is whether enough Members of the House now recognize that the current stem cell policy is not working and are willing to vote for a better way forward. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this vital legislation.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor of the House version of the Stem Cell Research Act of 2007, I rise in strong support for S. 5.

I firmly believe that stem cell research holds the promise of scientific breakthroughs and finding cures for life-threatening diseases that could improve the lives of millions of Americans. We should allow the expansion of federally funded research of human embryonic stem cell lines. This bipartisan legislation would accomplish that while establishing ethical guidelines.

This is an issue that affects every family in America. A majority of the American people support stem cell research. I was disappointed that the President exercised his first veto last year on a piece of similar legislation that has bipartisan support. The Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act of 2007 will be soon on the President's desk for his signature. I hope this time the President will listen to Congress and the American people rather than to the extreme right of his own political party and not wield his veto pen on such promising legislation. We cannot put politics over the health of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my House colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to applaud the passage of S. 5, the "Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act of 2007." This legislation will give hope to 100,000,000 Americans, by greatly expanding scientists' access

to embryonic stem cell lines and will create opportunities for medical and biological scientists to continue further investigation for additional stem cell lines. Moreover, this legislation will impact greatly the future of treatment of serious diseases.

During the last decade of research, significant scientific advancements have been made that allow scientists to research genetically stable and long lived human stem cells, by methods that would not destroy or endanger human embryos. The discovery of the new lines of stem cells has greatly enhanced the probability of additional discoveries in various treatment and cures. The support of continued research into this kind of scientific discovery gives great hope to many Americans and others around the world who depend on the scientific advancements that this country has been known for in decades past.

It is time that this groundbreaking research moves forward. I optimistically look forward to the many advances that will be made in the future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 464, the Senate bill is considered read and the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO COMMIT OFFERED BY MR. GINGREY

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to commit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GINGREY. I am in its present form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to commit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Gingrey moves to commit the bill (S. 5) to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Alternative Pluripotent Stem Cell Therapies Enhancement Act of 2007".

SEC. 2. PURPOSES.

It is the purpose of this Act to—

(1) intensify research that may result in improved understanding of or treatments for diseases and other adverse health conditions; and

(2) promote the derivation of pluripotent stem cell lines, including from postnatal sources, without creating human embryos for research purposes or discarding, destroying, or harming a human embryo or fetus.

SEC. 3. ALTERNATIVE HUMAN PLURIPOTENT STEM CELL RESEARCH.

Part B of title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 284 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 409I the following:

"SEC. 409J. ALTERNATIVE HUMAN PLURIPOTENT STEM CELL RESEARCH.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with section 492, the Secretary shall conduct and support basic and applied research to develop techniques for the isolation, derivation, production, or testing of stem cells that, like embryonic stem cells, are capable of producing all or almost all of the cell types of the developing body and may result in im-

proved understanding of or treatments for diseases and other adverse health conditions, but are not derived from a human embryo.

"(b) GUIDELINES.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary, after consultation with the Director of the National Institutes of Health, shall issue final guidelines to implement subsection (a), that—

"(1) provide guidance concerning the next steps required for additional research, which shall include a determination of the extent to which specific techniques may require additional basic or animal research to ensure that any research involving human cells using these techniques would clearly be consistent with the standards established under this section;

"(2) prioritize research with the greatest potential for near-term clinical benefit; and

"(3) consistent with subsection (a), take into account techniques outlined by the President's Council on Bioethics and any other appropriate techniques and research.

"(c) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Not later than January 1 of each year, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to the appropriate committees of the Congress a report describing the activities carried out under this section during the fiscal year, including a description of the research conducted under this section.

"(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect any policy, guideline, or regulation regarding embryonic stem cell research, human cloning by somatic cell nuclear transfer, or any other research not specifically authorized by this section.

"(e) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term 'human embryo' includes any organism, not protected as a human subject under part 46 of title 45, Code of Federal Regulations, as of the date of the enactment of the Alternative Pluripotent Stem Cell Therapies Enhancement Act of 2007, that is derived by fertilization, parthenogenesis, cloning, or any other means from one or more human gametes or human diploid cells.

"(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2010, to carry out this section."

Mr. GINGREY (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to commit be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, over the past 3 years, we have repeatedly stood on the floor of this House debating whether or not to expand the Federal Government's role in funding embryonic stem cell research. Today I implore my colleagues that, for once in this debate, let the facts speak louder than fiction. Let us all put aside political posturing and debate the impact of this legislation. Let us ensure that the American people hear the truth. We do not have to sacrifice human life to further stem cell research.

Once again, we find ourselves debating the same stem cell legislation without any input from the Members of this House. Essentially the Democratic

majority and their leadership is saying to the American people: This issue has not changed since we debated it in January, since we debated it last summer; in fact, since we debated it back in August of 2001. But that assumption is fundamentally wrong. The reality is that this issue has changed. Science has moved past bureaucracy and, in fact, past politics, to which it owes no allegiance.

There have been multiple scientific breakthroughs which show that there are other ways to achieve medical miracles without the collateral damage mandated by S. 5. The American people deserve a full and a comprehensive debate on these very, very successful alternatives. That is the reason that I am offering this motion to commit, which would replace S. 5 with a bill that was originally introduced by the other gentleman from Maryland, Mr. ROSCOE BARTLETT, and myself, called the Alternative Pluripotent Stem Cell Research Therapies Enhancement Act.

This act would authorize the use of Federal funds to research alternative and ethical ways to extract embryonic-like, or pluripotent, stem cells. That is what we should be debating on the floor of this esteemed body today, legislation that mitigates the gut-wrenching ethical questions of embryonic stem cell research that damages or, more likely, destroys human life.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is the hope of embryonic stem cell research is not grounded solely in the fact that these cells are embryonic; rather, researchers are interested in embryonic stem cells because they are flexible, and they can specialize into any type of human tissue. Indeed, I doubt that the scientists care where these cells come from.

Pluripotent stem cells can be obtained in a variety of ethical and scientifically promising ways. They do "not" have to come from a living embryo which some call medical waste but others embrace as "snowflake" babies with priceless lives.

Mr. Speaker, this point cannot be illustrated any more clearly than in the ground-breaking research published in several scientific journals since the beginning of this year. In fact, just yesterday, Nature Journal published a study that shows research's ability to literally reprogram an adult cell taken from skin to achieve one of these pluripotent, or embryonic-like, stem cell states. This research offers the promise of generating embryonic stem cells without the collateral damage of harming human embryos.

Let me read to you a fascinating quote from this article: "The race is now on to apply the surprisingly straightforward procedure to human cells. If researchers succeed, it will make it relatively easy to produce cells that seem indistinguishable from embryonic stem cells and that are genetically matched to individual patients." Mr. Speaker, that equates, my colleagues, to no rejection and no tumors. Hallelujah. Science has found a

way to support human life in terms of medical cures. The way we derive those cures is so important.

Earlier this year, researchers at Wake Forest University and Harvard published a study that showed the capability to obtain pluripotent stem cells again from amniotic fluid, which have the necessary characteristics of being fast-growing and flexible, and can be harvested, get this, Mr. Speaker, as early as 9 weeks into a pregnancy with no damage.

These are just two examples of new cutting-edge research which has fundamentally changed this stem cell debate. We no longer need to engage in an issue that divides this Congress, and indeed our country, in half. We no longer need to contemplate a unilateral decision to spend taxpayer dollars on research methods that half of the public morally opposes.

I ask my colleagues to vote “yes” on this motion to commit.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to commit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I want to be very clear. This motion to commit guts S. 5, pure and simple. What it does, it strips out the embryonic stem cell research portion of the bill, which of course is the bill. Instead, it simply leaves the section that also encourages alternative forms of research. So any Member of this House who supports embryonic stem cell research and who has voted for it in the past must oppose this motion to commit. Let me say it again: What this motion to commit does, it strips the embryonic stem cell research out of the bill.

Now, when I was a high school and college debater, one of the things that used to drive me crazy was inconsistency in my opponent’s position. We have seen that in spades today. Mr. GINGREY just said, for example, that he supports adult stem cell research because it doesn’t have the same kinds of problems that some embryonic stem cell research in mice have shown. In fact, though, the new study, which coincidentally just came out this week, just as a new study comes out every time we vote on embryonic stem cell research, the study on mice specifically says that these mouse cells, that the approach would have to be changed somewhat for use with human cells because it could cause cancer, just the criticism our opponents make of embryonic stem cell research. It’s true that embryonic stem cell research is relatively new. However, these other sources that our opponents tout are even newer and have provided no evidence and no hope for cures. That is why 80 Nobel Laureates and 1,300 scientists have endorsed embryonic stem cell research as well as research into adult stem cells and other types of research.

What our bill does is, it says, let’s do everything in an ethical way. Let’s

have ethically conducted embryonic stem cells, but only on embryos that are scheduled to be discarded as medical waste. Let’s not throw them out. Let’s use them to give hope to the millions of Americans who suffer from diseases for which adult stem cell research has shown no promise at all. That is why all of these researchers say we have to support both embryonic stem cell and adult stem cell and other types of alternatives.

□ 1330

They say there have been no cures found, but, again, just last week, researchers in Great Britain, because this research is going overseas, have found evidence that embryonic stem cell research may cure macular degeneration, which causes blindness in humans. Our friends, many of them formerly from U.S. universities who are in Great Britain, think that we will have a clinical application of this embryonic stem cell research within 5 years.

I want to conclude by saying, it is not either/or. It is both, so long as they are done ethically. Alan Leshner, Ph.D., with the American Association for the Advancement of Science, said, “It is only through Federal support of research on both adult and embryonic stem cells that we may better understand the potential value and limitations of each type. We owe all those who may be helped by such research in the future to pursue all avenues of potential treatments and cures for serious diseases.”

Mr. Speaker, this motion to commit will kill the bill. Anyone who supports hope for the 110 million Americans who suffer from these terrible diseases must vote “no” on the motion to commit and “yes” on final passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to commit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to commit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 180, nays 242, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 442]

YEAS—180

Aderholt	Blunt	Calvert
Akin	Boehner	Camp (MI)
Alexander	Bonner	Campbell (CA)
Bachmann	Boozman	Cannon
Bachus	Boustany	Carter
Baker	Brady (TX)	Chabot
Barrett (SC)	Brown (SC)	Cole (OK)
Bartlett (MD)	Buchanan	Conaway
Bilirakis	Burgess	Costello
Bishop (UT)	Burton (IN)	Crenshaw
Blackburn	Buyer	Cubin

Culberson	King (IA)	Price (GA)
Davis (KY)	King (NY)	Putnam
Davis, David	Kingston	Radanovich
Davis, Jo Ann	Kline (MN)	Rahall
Davis, Lincoln	Knollenberg	Rehberg
Deal (GA)	Kuhl (NY)	Renzi
Diaz-Balart, L.	LaHood	Reynolds
Diaz-Balart, M.	Lamborn	Rogers (AL)
Donnelly	Latham	Rogers (KY)
Doolittle	Lewis (CA)	Rogers (MI)
Drake	Lewis (KY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Dreier	Linder	Roskam
Duncan	Lipinski	Royce
Ehlers	LoBiondo	Ryan (WI)
Ellsworth	Lucas	Sali
English (PA)	Lungren, Daniel	Saxton
Everett	E.	Schmidt
Fallin	Manzullo	Sensenbrenner
Feeney	Marchant	Sessions
Ferguson	Marshall	Shadegg
Forbes	McCarthy (CA)	Shimkus
Fortenberry	McCauley (TX)	Shuler
Fox	McCotter	Shuster
Franks (AZ)	McCreery	Simpson
Gallely	McHenry	Smith (NE)
Garrett (NJ)	McHugh	Smith (NJ)
Gillmor	McIntyre	Smith (TX)
Gingrey	McKeon	Souder
Gohmert	McMorris	Stearns
Goode	Rodgers	Stupak
Goodlatte	Mica	Sullivan
Graves	Miller (FL)	Taylor
Hall (TX)	Miller (MI)	Terry
Hastert	Miller, Gary	Thornberry
Hastings (WA)	Mollohan	Tiahrt
Hayes	Moran (KS)	Tiberi
Hensarling	Murphy, Tim	Turner
Herger	Musgrave	Walberg
Hobson	Myrick	Walsh (NY)
Hoekstra	Neugebauer	Wamp
Hulshof	Nunes	Weld (FL)
Hunter	Oberstar	Weller
Inglis (SC)	Paul	Westmoreland
Issa	Pearce	Whitfield
Jindal	Pence	Wicker
Johnson (IL)	Peterson (MN)	Wilson (SC)
Johnson, Sam	Peterson (PA)	Wolf
Jones (NC)	Petri	Young (AK)
Jordan	Pitts	Young (FL)
Keller	Poe	

NAYS—242

Abercrombie	Coble	Gutierrez
Ackerman	Cohen	Hall (NY)
Allen	Conyers	Hare
Altmire	Cooper	Harman
Andrews	Costa	Heller
Arcuri	Courtney	Herseth Sandlin
Baca	Cramer	Higgins
Baird	Crowley	Hill
Baldwin	Cuellar	Hinchee
Barrow	Cummings	Hinojosa
Barton (TX)	Davis (AL)	Hirono
Bean	Davis (CA)	Hodes
Becerra	Davis (IL)	Holt
Berkley	Davis, Tom	Honda
Berman	DeFazio	Hooley
Berry	DeGette	Hoyer
Biggert	Delahunt	Inslee
Bilbray	DeLauro	Israel
Bishop (GA)	Dent	Jackson (IL)
Bishop (NY)	Dicks	Jackson-Lee
Blumenauer	Dingell	(TX)
Bono	Doggett	Johnson (GA)
Boren	Doyle	Johnson, E. B.
Boswell	Edwards	Jones (OH)
Boucher	Ellison	Kanjorski
Boyd (FL)	Emanuel	Kaptur
Boyda (KS)	Emerson	Kennedy
Brady (PA)	Engel	Kildee
Braley (IA)	Eshoo	Kilpatrick
Brown, Corrine	Etheridge	Kind
Brown-Waite,	Farr	Kirk
Ginny	Fattah	Klein (FL)
Butterfield	Filner	Kucinich
Capito	Flake	Lampson
Capps	Fossella	Langevin
Capuano	Frank (MA)	Lantos
Cardoza	Frelinghuysen	Larsen (WA)
Carnahan	Gerlach	Larson (CT)
Carney	Giffords	LaTourette
Carson	Gilchrest	Lee
Castle	Gillibrand	Levin
Castor	Gonzalez	Lewis (GA)
Chandler	Gordon	Loebsack
Clarke	Granger	Logren, Zoe
Clay	Green, Al	Lowe
Cleaver	Green, Gene	Lynch
Clyburn	Grijalva	Mack

Mahoney (FL) Perlmutter Snyder
 Maloney (NY) Platts Solis
 Markey Price (NC) Space
 Matheson Pryce (OH) Spratt
 Matsui Ramstad Stark
 McCarthy (NY) Rangel Sutton
 McCollum (MN) Regula Tanner
 McDermott Reichert Tauscher
 McGovern Reyes Thompson (CA)
 McNerney Rodriguez Thompson (MS)
 McNulty Rohrabacher Tierney
 Meehan Ross Towns
 Meek (FL) Rothman Udall (CO)
 Meeks (NY) Roybal-Allard Udall (NM)
 Melancon Ruppertsberger Upton
 Michaud Rush Van Hollen
 Miller (NC) Salazar Velázquez
 Miller, George Sánchez, Linda
 Mitchell T. Walden (OR)
 Moore (KS) Sanchez, Loretta Walz (MN)
 Moore (WI) Sarbanes Wasserman
 Moran (VA) Schakowsky Schultz
 Murphy (CT) Schiff Waters
 Murphy, Patrick Schwartz Watson
 Murtha Scott (GA) Watt
 Nadler Scott (VA) Waxman
 Napolitano Serrano Weiner
 Neal (MA) Sestak Welch (VT)
 Obey Shays Wexler
 Olver Shea-Porter Wilson (NM)
 Ortiz Sherman Wilson (OH)
 Pallone Sires Woolsey
 Pascrell Skelton Wu
 Pastor Slaughter Wynn
 Payne Smith (WA) Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

Cantor Kagen Ryan (OH)
 Hastings (FL) Pickering Tancredo
 Holden Pomeroy
 Jefferson Porter

□ 1357

Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Messrs. OLVER, ABERCROMBIE, GENE GREEN of Texas, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Ms. SLAUGHTER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. ROGERS of Alabama, SAXTON, WELDON of Florida, TURNER, CALVERT, BARRETT of South Carolina, DONNELLY, KING of New York, SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and KING of Iowa changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to commit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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 ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 247, nays 176, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 443]

YEAS—247

Abercrombie Berry Brown-Waite,
 Ackerman Biggert Ginny
 Allen Bilbray Butterfield
 Altmire Bishop (GA) Calvert
 Andrews Bishop (NY) Capito
 Arcuri Blumenauer Capps
 Baca Bono Capuano
 Baird Boren Cardoza
 Baldwin Boswell Carnahan
 Barrow Boucher Carney
 Barton (TX) Boyd (FL) Carson
 Bean Boyda (KS) Castle
 Becerra Brady (PA) Castor
 Berkley Braley (IA) Chandler
 Berman Brown, Corrine Clarke

Clay Cleaver Jackson (IL)
 Clyburn Jackson-Lee (TX)
 Coble Johnson (GA)
 Cohen Reichen, E. B.
 Conyers Jones (OH)
 Cooper Kanjorski
 Costa Kennedy
 Courtney Kildee
 Cramer Kilpatrick
 Crowley Kind
 Cuellar Kirk
 Cummings Klein (FL)
 Davis (AL) Kucinich
 Davis (CA) Lampson
 Davis (IL) Langevin
 Davis, Tom Lantos
 DeFazio Larsen (WA)
 DeGette Larson (CT)
 Delahunt LaTourette
 DeLauro Lee
 Dent Levin
 Dicks Lewis (CA)
 Dingell Lewis (GA)
 Doggett Loebsock
 Doyle Lofgren, Zoe
 Dreier Lowe
 Edwards Lynch
 Ellison Mack
 Emanuel Mahoney (FL)
 Emerson Mahoney (NY)
 Engel Markey
 Eshoo Matheson
 Etheridge Matsui
 Farr McCarthy (NY)
 Fattah McCollum (MN)
 Filner McDermott
 Fossella McGovern
 Frank (MA) McKeon
 Frelinghuysen McNerney
 Gerlach McNulty
 Giffords Meehan
 Gilchrest Meek (FL)
 Gillibrand Meeks (NY)
 Gonzalez Melancon
 Gordon Michaud
 Granger Miller (NC)
 Green, Al Miller, George
 Green, Gene Mitchell
 Grijalva Moore (KS)
 Gutierrez Moore (WI)
 Hall (NY) Moran (VA)
 Hare Murphy (CT)
 Harman Murphy, Patrick
 Heller Murtha
 Herseth Sandlin Nadler
 Higgins Napolitano
 Hill Neal (MA)
 Hinchey Obey
 Hinojosa Olver
 Hirono Ortiz
 Hodes Pallone
 Holt Pascrell
 Honda Pastor
 Hoolley Payne
 Hoyer Pelosi
 Insole Perlmutter
 Israel Platts
 Issa Price (NC)

NAYS—176

Aderholt Conaway Gallegly
 Akin Costello Garrett (NJ)
 Alexander Crenshaw Gillmor
 Bachmann Cubin Gingrey
 Bachus Culberson Gohmert
 Baker Davis (KY) Goode
 Barrett (SC) Davis, David Goodlatte
 Bartlett (MD) Davis, Jo Ann Graves
 Bilirakis Davis, Lincoln Hall (TX)
 Bishop (UT) Deal (GA) Hastert
 Blackburn Diaz-Balart, L. Hastings (WA)
 Blunt Diaz-Balart, M. Hayes
 Boehner Donnelly Hensarling
 Bonner Doolittle Herger
 Boozman Drake Hobson
 Boustany Duncan Hoekstra
 Brady (TX) Ehlers Hulshof
 Brown (SC) Ellsworth Hunter
 Buchanan English (PA) Inglis (SC)
 Burgess Everett Jindal
 Burton (IN) Fallon Johnson (IL)
 Buyer Feeney Johnson, Sam
 Camp (MI) Ferguson Jones (NC)
 Campbell (CA) Flake Jordan
 Cannon Forbes Kaptur
 Carter Fortenberry Keller
 Chabot Foxx King (IA)
 Cole (OK) Franks (AZ) King (NY)

Kingston Kline (MN) Murphy, Tim
 Knollenberg Myrick Musgrave
 Kuhl (NY) Neugebauer Shimkus
 LaHood Nunes Shuler
 Lamborn Oberstar Shuster
 Latham Paul Simpson
 Lewis (KY) Pearce Smith (NE)
 Linder Pence Smith (NJ)
 Lipinski Peterson (MN) Smith (TX)
 LoBiondo Peterson (PA) Souder
 Lucas Petri Stearns
 Lungren, Daniel Pitts Stupak
 E. Poe Sullivan
 Manzullo Price (GA) Taylor
 Marchant Putnam Terry
 Marshall Radanovich Thornberry
 McCarthy (CA) Rahall Tiahrt
 McCaul (TX) Rehberg Tiberi
 McCotter Renzi Turner
 McCreery Reynolds Walberg
 McHenry Rogers (AL) Walsh (NY)
 McHugh Rogers (KY) Wamp
 McIntyre Rogers (MI) Weldon (FL)
 McMorris Ros-Lehtinen Weller
 Rodgers Roskam Westmoreland
 Mica Royce Whitfield
 Miller (FL) Ryan (WI) Wicker
 Miller (MI) Sali Wilson (OH)
 Miller, Gary Saxton Wilson (SC)
 Mollohan Schmidt
 Moran (KS) Sensenbrenner Wolf

NOT VOTING—10

Cantor Kagen Ryan (OH)
 Hastings (FL) Pickering Tancredo
 Holden Pomeroy
 Jefferson Porter

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1404

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1756

Mr. HUNTER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD) removed as a cosponsor to H.R. 1756.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. TAUSCHER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

LUMBEE RECOGNITION ACT

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 465 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 465

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 65) to provide for the recognition of the Lumbee Tribe of North Carolina, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order