

country. We have to empower these people, and that means getting government out of the way, creating life that's more simple.

Now, is there a role and responsibility for government to regulate certain things, for instance on Wall Street? Of course there is. Nobody has ever suggested that we just simply get rid of everything, but we have not streamlined the process.

Look, I'm a Republican. The President has said several things that I agree with, that I applaud him for—the ending of no-bid contracts, a push for earmark reform; he said he wants smaller government. I even like the fact that he put the Iraq appropriations into the base budget instead of these supplemental appropriations, and I applaud him for that. But it is imperative for the American people to hold their public leaders accountable for what they say they're going to do. I think that's all we ask. I've got a wife, I've got three kids. All I want them to do is I just want my kids to do what they say they're going to do.

And so when the President calls for appropriations without earmarks, and the very next day—the very next day—we get to vote on a bill with 8,500 earmarks in it, you just have to look at that and say, wait a second, the talk is good, but are we actually walking the walk? It's not yet happening.

We don't have time to wait anymore. We talk about smaller government. Well, we just passed the single largest spending bill in the history of the United States of America for \$1 trillion—\$1 trillion. We had just something like 13 hours to actually review it. Please, we have to be held accountable.

I'm a freshman. It is an honor and a privilege to serve the United States Congress. I didn't create this problem, but I am here to help clean it up. And for those of us that have been elected, entrusted by the people, the constituents within our districts, I say, please, hold us all accountable; raise expectations. It is not government, it is not government that is going to get us out of this; it is going to be the empowerment of the entrepreneur, it is going to be the empowerment of the American people that will drive and propel this country forward. It is always what has created the greatest success in the United States of America. It is the power that makes us the greatest country on the face of this planet. But we have to make sure that we keep government in check.

It's about smaller government, not bigger government. Please, I ask that we be united and fight for this cause, fight for the American entrepreneur. Keep government limited, keep it out of our way, and empower the American people.

CERTIFICATION REGARDING EXPORT OF CERTAIN ITEMS TO THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 111-21)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, without objection, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 1512 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105-261), I hereby certify to the Congress that the export of two environmental chambers to be used to test automotive parts is not detrimental to the U.S. space launch industry, and that the material and equipment, including any indirect technical benefit that could be derived from this export, will not measurably improve the missile or space launch capabilities of the People's Republic of China.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 3, 2009.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO ZIMBABWE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 111-22)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the Federal Register and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice to the Federal Register for publication, stating that the national emergency with respect to the actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Zimbabwe and other persons to undermine Zimbabwe's democratic processes or institutions is to continue in effect beyond March 6, 2009.

The crisis constituted by the actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Zimbabwe and other persons to undermine Zimbabwe's democratic processes or institutions has not been resolved. These actions and policies pose a continuing unusual and extraordinary threat to the foreign policy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue this national

emergency and to maintain in force the sanctions to respond to this threat.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 3, 2009.

THE PROTECTION OF LIFE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he might consume to my good friend and colleague, ZACH WAMP.

Mr. WAMP. I thank the Speaker, and most of all I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his extraordinary leadership. He brings us to the floor today to talk about something that doesn't get enough attention.

At a time of economic duress and hardship, all eyes are on the economy, and for many reasons that is absolutely right. But there are some real big issues that, frankly, are being overlooked under this new administration and across the country today and they are fundamental to what kind of people we are.

Today, we're talking about the protection of life. We all know that abortion divides our country. And we're grateful for all those Americans who say that they want to reduce the number of abortions in our country, those that say that they oppose abortion, but then when it comes time, as the previous speaker said, to actually enact policies, that's the most important time that you can actually stand up for what you say you believe.

With the stroke of a pen, we now have a new executive order that says that taxpayers, basically, in this country will fund abortions that Americans want to have anywhere in the world. That is something overwhelmingly opposed by the American people, that their taxpayer dollars would go to fund abortion.

We teach our children the lesson of the boiled frogs, where if you throw a frog in a pot of boiling water it will jump right back out, but if you leave the frog in cold water and slowly turn the temperature up, that frog will die and never leave the water. So, over time, here we are just becoming more and more accustomed to this harsh treatment of innocent life by the people of the greatest Nation in the history of the world.

This issue of abortion does divide us, but there are fundamental truths about the protection of innocent life from conception forward and our Constitution, which we all swear to uphold, protecting life.

Today, Mr. SMITH is going to go into detail about why it is so important for those of us who believe as we believe—many of us on religious convictions—that we should protect all innocent life, and how, frankly, that is under assault in this country today, sometimes

by the stroke of a pen, sometimes on the floor of this great deliberative body, but it is constantly now something that is under attack.

□ 1630

I have recently reintroduced a bill that is very related, H.R. 1050, reintroduced with an outstanding Member of Congress from the Democratic side, Representative BART STUPAK from Michigan, a devout Catholic. He and I have introduced H.R. 1050, which bans human cloning.

Listen, most people would say, what, you have to pass a bill to ban human cloning? Human cloning is not banned under the laws of the United States of America? And the answer is no.

Now, interestingly, seven of the other G8 countries, the industrialized nations, including Canada, France, Germany and Italy, have completely, unequivocally, banned human cloning, but not the United States of America, no.

If anything, I would think it would be the other way around. We would have been the first to say “no” to human cloning, but with the G8 we are the last.

This process that the proponents of cloning call therapeutic cloning is advancing to the degree that reproductive cloning, the cloning of human beings, is just the next step. Many have given testimony here at the Commerce Committee, the health subcommittee, that human cloning is just a matter of time. It’s not if it will happen in this country, it’s when it will happen in this country.

The other industrialized countries, the sophisticated countries of the world have said, no, ban it, stop it. This is a Frankenstein-type outcome. This is fundamental. It’s not gray, it’s black and white.

This does not ban embryonic stem cell research. It bans embryonic human cloning. This is a fundamental question of what we are all about and whether or not we will allow this.

Even the United Nations, which is not exactly a conservative body in the world, passed a declaration to adopt all measures necessary to prohibit all forms of human cloning inasmuch as they are incompatible with human dignity and the protection of human life.

This hour is dedicated to the protection of human life. Let’s ban human cloning in this country, surely to goodness. We can do that in a bipartisan way on the floor of this House.

I call on the House to support BART STUPAK and ZACH WAMP in H.R. 1050.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my good friend, but especially for his extraordinary work on banning human cloning and for his leadership on life issues in general.

Madam Speaker, human embryo-destroying stem cell research is not only unethical, unworkable and unreliable, it is now demonstrably unnecessary.

Recent spectacular breakthroughs in noncontroversial adult stem cell re-

search and clinical applications to effectuate cures with the mitigation of disease or disability have been well documented. For several years, significant progress has been achieved with adult stem cells derived from non-embryonic sources, including umbilical cord blood, bone marrow, brain, amniotic fluid, skin and even fat cells. Patients with diseases, including leukemia, type 1 diabetes, multiple sclerosis, lupus, sickle cell anemia and dozens of other maladies have significantly benefitted from adult stem cell transfers.

Members will recall back in 2005, President Bush signed legislation that I authored, along with my friend and colleague, Mr. ARTUR DAVIS, which provided \$265 million to establish a comprehensive nationwide network to collect, type and disseminate, using best practices, umbilical cord blood, the aftermath, the leftover, the medical waste, after a baby is born.

Some 4 million women give birth in the United States every year. In the past, the umbilical cord and the placenta was simply thrown away, despite the fact that it is teeming with stem cells that could be used to effectuate cures and to mitigate disease. The legislation combined cord blood and bone marrow efforts under HRSA, so now we have a program, a nationwide program, to try to help people who are suffering from serious disease.

We know that leukemia patients can be greatly benefitted, in some cases cured, from leukemia as a result of those transplants. Many of our African-American friends, some 1 out of every 500 who suffer from sickle cell anemia can also benefit greatly from these kinds of transplantations. That legislation is being run by HRSA and it is working.

Adult stem cells, Madam Speaker, are truly remarkable. They work, they have no ethical baggage, and advances are made every day at a dizzying pace.

But perhaps the greatest breakthrough of all, Madam Speaker, was the discovery of a process that turns every day ordinary skin cells into pluripotent embryo-like stem cells.

On November 20, 2007, Japanese scientists Shinya Yamanaka and Wisconsin researcher James Thompson shocked the scientific community by independently announcing their ability to derive pluripotent stem cells to the reprogramming of regular skin cells, regular skin cells turned into pluripotent skin cells. The iPS cells, as they are called, are made by adding a small number of factors or genes to regular skin cells in a Petri dish that can remodel mature cells into stem cells that are functionally identical to those obtained from embryos.

In other words, Madam Speaker, scientists have found a way of transforming your cells, skin cells, and mine, into stem cells called induced pluripotent stem cells or iPS. Pluripotent stem cells are those miraculous building block cells that can be

coaxed into becoming any type of tissue found in the human body.

Unlike embryonic stem cells that kill the donor, are highly unstable, have a propensity to morph into tumors and are likely to be rejected by the patient unless strong anti-rejection medicines are administered, induced pluripotent cells, stem cells, have none of those deficiencies and are emerging as the future, the greatest hope of regenerative medicine. While some Members of Congress and President Obama still don’t get it, the breakthroughs have not been lost on the mainstream press.

For example, on November 21 Reuters reported, and I quote, “Two separate teams of researchers announced on Tuesday they had transformed ordinary skin cells into batches of cells that look and act like embryonic stem cells, but without using cloning technology and without making embryos.”

The New York Times reported on this same day, “Two teams of scientists reported yesterday that they had turned human skin cells into what appear to be embryonic stem cells without having to make or destroy an embryo—a feat that could quell the ethical debate troubling the field.”

The Associated Press said, “Scientists have created the equivalent of embryonic stem cells from ordinary skin cells, a breakthrough that could someday produce new treatments for diseases without the explosive moral questions of embryo cloning.”

Even University of Wisconsin’s Dr. James Thompson, the man who first cultured embryonic stem cells, told The New York Times, “Now with the new technique, which involves adding just four genes to ordinary skin cells, it will not be long before the stem cell wars are a distant memory. ‘A decade from now, this will just be a funny historical footnote.’”

Dr. Thompson told the Detroit Free Press, “While ducking ethical debate wasn’t the goal, (it is) probably the beginning of the end of the controversy over embryonic stem cells.”

In Medical News Today, Dr. Thompson went on to say, “Speaking about this latest breakthrough, the induced cells do all the things embryonic cells do. It’s going to completely change the field.”

“The other advantage of the new method is the fact that using cells drawn from the patient’s own skin, the stem cells can be customized to the patient, bringing numerous benefits, such as the elimination of immune system rejection. They are probably more clinically relevant than embryonic stem cells.”

Madam Speaker, this past Monday, more good news, no, let’s call it great news on the iPS front. Research teams from the United Kingdom and Canada published two papers in the prestigious scientific journal, Nature, announcing that they had successfully reprogrammed ordinary skin cells into induced pluripotent skin cells without

the use of viruses to transmit the re-programming genes to the cell. Using a "piggyback" system, as they called it, the scientists were able to insert DNA where they could alter the genetic make-up of the regular cell before being harmlessly removed.

According to many scientists, the removal of potentially cancer-causing viruses means this breakthrough increases the likelihood that iPS cells will be safe for clinical use in human patients. The lead scientist from Canada, Andras Nagy, was quoted in the Washington Post saying, "It's a leap forward in the safe application of these cells. We expect this to have a massive impact on this field."

And George Daley at Children's Hospital in Boston said, "It's very significant. I think it's a major step forward in realizing the value of these cells for medical research."

This breakthrough, Madam Speaker, suggests the momentum has decisively and irrevocably swung to non-controversial stem cell research like iPS cells and away from embryo-destroying research. The lead scientist from the UK was quoted in the BBC saying, "It is a step towards the practical use of reprogrammed cells in medicine, perhaps even eliminating the need for human embryos as a source of stem cells."

Finally, in the Washington Post Dr. Nagy made a series of interesting comments this week. First, that his studies showed that the iPS cells had many of the properties of embryonic stem cells. Secondly, while the research in this case was done on fetal cells, the approach had worked equally well with adult stem cells. And, third, since iPS cell research should no longer require the specialization of virus labs and researchers, the number of researchers working on iPS cells is expected to increase again beyond the large number already devoting their attention to induced pluripotent cells since November of 2007. There has been an explosion in this area, because this holds the greatest promise.

Time magazine reports, reporting on the efficacy and the advantage of iPS stem cells, "The iPS technology is the ultimate manufacturing process for cells; it is now possible for researchers to churn out unlimited quantities of a patient's stem cells, which can then be turned into any of the cells that the body might need to replace or repair."

Despite all of this, Madam Speaker, this new and extraordinary progress in the iPS and adult stem cell research arena, the Obama administration and the House and Senate Democratic leadership remain obsessed with killing human embryos for experimentation at taxpayer expense.

Why persist in the dehumanizing of nascent human life when better alternatives exist, alternatives that work on both ethics grounds and efficacy grounds. Nonembryonic stem cell research is the present and it is the future of regenerative medicine, and the only responsible way forward.

At this point, Madam Speaker, I would like to yield to my good friend and colleague, VIRGINIA FOXX.

Ms. FOXX. I want to thank my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) for sharing this time with me and for taking the lead on this special order on stem cell research.

I want to also say that I want to associate myself with the remarks from our colleague from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP) in saying that this is an extremely important issue for us to be dealing with.

If we don't deal with the issue of life, if we don't deal with what are the ethical principles that drive us, then the other things really don't matter. We have a lot of things that are weighing on people's minds in terms of the economy, and we know that's important, and we are very concerned about folks who have lost their jobs and who are struggling with the economy.

□ 1645

But what's most important is that we deal with the essential elements of what makes us human beings, and I think it's important that we are doing this Special Order tonight.

One of the most gratifying experiences that I have had since I have been in Congress was one night about 3½ years ago when we were supposed to be doing a Special Order on stem cell research. We were scheduled to do that. I wasn't going to lead it, but all of my colleagues suddenly had conflicts and asked me if I would lead the Special Order. I was standing right here and I spoke for about 40 minutes about the issue. And when I got back to my office, which took me about 5 minutes, it was at 9:30 at night, and one of my staffers was still there waiting for me, and she told me that she'd had a call, as soon as I finished my speaking on the floor, from a gentleman from Maryland. He said he had never watched C-SPAN in his life. He was surfing through the channels, saw this little gray-haired woman standing on the floor of the House, wondered how an average citizen was able to stand on the floor of the House and speak because he thought it was only Members of Congress that could do that. So he stopped to listen. And he heard my description of stem cell research. And he just called to thank me for doing it and to tell me that he didn't understand the issue and now he did and he was very gratified by that.

So I am very, very pleased that our speaking to people about this issue does make a difference, and I hope that by having this Special Order today, we will have many people who understand the issue better and will have their minds changed if they were going in the wrong direction or have their minds made up if they didn't have an opinion.

What I did that night was describe basically what stem cell research is and what are the differences in the way people talk about it, and I think that continues to be an important issue.

I am a very strong pro-life person. All people who are pro-life are in favor of stem cell research. I support stem cell research. Many people believe that pro-life people do not support stem cell research.

However, we don't support research that requires the killing of human life. That's what's important to us. We know that we can do stem cell research without destroying human life. We also know that a lot of taxpayer money is being spent on embryonic stem cell research. And I think, frankly, we're paying more than our fair share for research that many people find to be morally repugnant.

For 2008 NIH estimated it would spend \$37 million on embryonic stem cell research. That \$37 million is not nothing; it is a lot of money. However, from that money we have achieved no positive results. That is, we have nothing to show for all the money that has gone into embryonic stem cell research. That point needs to be made over and over again because we have gained treatment for 70 diseases through the use of adult stem cell research, and what separates those of us who are pro-life from those who are pro-abortion is that we support research into adult stem cells.

One of the reasons I am also very excited about the research that is going on in adult stem cells is because Dr. Anthony Atala and his team at Wake Forest in the Institute of Regenerative Medicine are getting great results as a result of their research into adult stem cells and they are not destroying human life. Dr. Atala, who came to Wake Forest from Harvard and brought a large team with him, is a tissue engineering specialist, and he has found that amniotic fluid stem cells have those pluripotent properties that have been pointed out earlier that grow as fast as embryonic stem cells. He's received tremendously positive response, particularly in growing bladders. In addition, stem cells coming from the umbilical cord and from the placenta and amniotic fluid have shown tremendous results, as my colleague Mr. SMITH has talked about.

So it's important that we always distinguish between adult stem cell research and embryonic stem cell research. We must continue to educate the American public on this issue, and we need to explain to people the ethical questions that we are dealing with.

We should never in this country sanction research that would harm other human beings. Many of us know that there was research done in the 1930s with prisoners that was very wrong. We have condemned that research over and over again. But since that time, we have had very, very strong and ethical programs to protect adults from diseases that would cause them harm and that would cause them death, and yet people don't see the same problem when we are dealing with embryos, and we must point that out to people. We are crossing an ethical Rubicon when

we sanction using embryos for research or creating embryos for this research. That is going over the line, and we must explain that to the American public. We must explain the long-term implications for our society and for the human race. Not being careful to take care of human life at the beginning of life has implications for whether we will take care of human life all throughout life and particularly at the end of life. We also have to point out that we have gotten much better results, again, from the use of adult stem cells and umbilical cords and other ways to get cells other than destroying life.

I hope today that there's at least one other person like the gentleman in Maryland who saw me do this 4 years ago and who's understanding this issue for the first time and understands particularly the distinction that we are making between doing ethical research on adult stem cells and what most of us consider is unethical research on embryos which will destroy them. Then we can continue to support programs like that of Dr. Atala at Wake Forest University and other places where they're seeing excellent results. That's the kind of research this country should be doing. We know we can get good results from that.

And I want to support again my colleagues who are here tonight speaking on this issue and helping the American public and others understand it. We are an ethical people, and we want to continue to be an ethical people and do research that will produce good results.

With that, Madam Speaker, I yield back to the leader for tonight, Mr. SMITH.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thank you, Congresswoman FOXX, for your wonderful and very incisive comments today, and I really appreciate your leadership on life issues as well, especially when it comes to embryonic stem cell research and the alternative that is, without question, adult stem cells and especially induced pluripotent stem cells derived from such everyday skin that we all carry on our bodies, which has proven to be highly efficacious and works, and I think it is the future.

I would like to now yield to Mr. FORTENBERRY.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. First, let me thank the gentleman from New Jersey for conducting this very, very important discussion.

Madam Speaker, over the past several years, I have received scores of letters from my constituents that reflect widespread national confusion about stem cell research. Let me take a few moments to cut through the fog on this important issue.

There are two types of stem cell research often confused in our public debate. The first, which I wholeheartedly and enthusiastically support, is the type of stem cell research which uses cells derived from sources such as cord blood, skin, and bone marrow, com-

monly known as adult stem cell research. This is good science, helping to save American lives and providing real treatment options now.

The American people deserve to know that adult stem cell science is progressing at a staggering pace, showcasing over 70 successful clinical treatment models for conditions ranging from heart disease to Parkinson's disease, spinal cord injury, sickle cell anemia, stroke damage, leukemia, chronic liver disease, and many, many more. The empirical evidence is sound, and it really is eye opening, giving hope to those who suffer from these debilitating conditions.

Madam Speaker, the American people also deserve to know that there is a clear distinction between adult stem cell science and embryonic stem cell science. Between hope and promise for cures on the one hand and misleading, misguided efforts to funnel their tax dollars to bail out research companies, research enterprises, that thrive on the destruction of nascent human beings, embryos, who are no less human than Members of this august legislative body.

Widely touted and vigorously promoted nationwide as a potential cure for many of the same conditions that adult stem cell research may treat, embryonic stem cell research requires the destruction of unborn human persons to derive stem cells for research. We know that embryonic human life is still human life. The marvels of modern science leave no room for confusion on this important point. Moreover, embryonic stem cell research has shown no clinical success to date. It represents a degradation of human life that is wrong. Science that harms human beings, no matter how small they are, no matter how vulnerable they are or easily disposable they are, is always wrong.

With so many proven ethical alternatives, embryonic stem cell research presents an unnecessary moral dilemma for persons of goodwill. It siphons limited Federal funds away from adult stem cell research that is now saving lives. And American taxpayers, who have recently been asked to shoulder an unprecedented deficit that will burden generations to come, should not be forced to pay for it. Adult stem cell research works, saves lives, and avoids the ethically divisive issue of the destruction of innocent and unborn human life.

So, again, with that I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey for conducting this important dialogue.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank Mr. FORTENBERRY for his leadership. He has shown, since he has been here, himself to be not only a leader but someone who thinks both inside and outside the box on so many human rights and humanitarian issues. And this is a human rights and humanitarian issue, and I thank him for his contribution not just today on the floor but every day as a Member of this august body.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Thank you very much.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I would like to yield to Mr. FORBES.

And before doing so, I'd just remind our colleagues that a couple of years ago, Mr. FORBES and Mr. LIPINSKI brought a researcher from Brazil and a researcher from the United States who had another breakthrough, in this case cord blood, for type 1 diabetics. And some of the diabetics, virtually all except two, who had been given cord blood transplantation got off their insulin. They were no longer insulin dependent. And, again, so many people in this Chamber, so many people in the White House, and perhaps even HHS don't seem to get it; that the real progress, the real advances are being made in the realm of adult stem cells, and those kinds of advances are being made each and every day. And Mr. FORBES is the prime sponsor of some very, very important legislation dealing with adult stem cells, which I hope he will elaborate on.

I yield to Mr. FORBES.

Mr. FORBES. Thank you, Congressman SMITH. And I also want to thank Congressman FORTENBERRY for his comments and to begin by saying that many of us come to this debate for different reasons. Some because of philosophical reasons, some for political reasons. I come to it for a rather personal reason.

My father, about 5 years ago, died from Parkinson's disease. My brother currently has Parkinson's disease. So it's near and dear to my heart. But what's most important is I don't need political debates or political rhetoric. What I need is some cures or I need someone who can provide some way of treating those illnesses.

If you just step back and take a moment, as Congressman SMITH has pointed out, we find that all of the major breakthroughs have been with adult stem cells, not with embryonic cells. In fact, I have here a scorecard, and I know no one can see this in the body tonight, but if you showed the victories for peer-reviewed studies from adult stem cells, you would have 73 different illnesses that have been treated successfully with adult stem cells. And then if you look on the embryonic side, you would find 0 over there.

And one of the exciting things for us as we go through this debate is, as I travel around, I find, Congressman, as I know you do, that a lot of people really do not understand the difference between the two because the debate gets muddled many times; but as Congressman FORTENBERRY pointed out so correctly to us, we really have now three major types of cells that we're talking about.

□ 1700

We are talking about the adult stem cells, which have absolutely no ethical problems and have shown all of the benefits for really dealing with illnesses. We then have the embryonic

stem cells, which have a number of ethical concerns and have shown absolutely no benefits in treating illnesses. And now we have the induced pluripotent stem cells, or the IPS cells, which are ethical, because they, Congressman, as I think you mentioned, really come back from the adult cells as we work back and reprogram those and they have all the capacity of the embryonic cells without any of the ethical problems.

So really what we have is a situation where the science in this whole discussion has outpaced the debate, and the science has now proven that we really don't need the research for the embryonic stem cells. But in a day and age where every day we give up and see so much negative news, there is some exciting, good news, as Congressman SMITH has pointed out, and I would like tonight just to talk about some of those great advances that we have seen.

First of all, in 2007, the Journal of the American Medical Association published a study on the first stem cell treatment for diabetes patients. Researchers from Northwestern University and Brazil performed a clinical trial with 15 diabetic patients, and 13 of the 15 patients with type 1 diabetes were insulin-free after receiving an adult stem cell transplant using blood stem cells.

In 2002, doctors treated a patient for Parkinson's disease with his own neural stem cells. This is the world's first clinical trial using stem cells for the treatment of Parkinson's disease. Doctors actually isolated the patient's stem cells, induced them to differentiate into the desired nervous system cells and implanted them back into the patients' brain.

Just a few weeks ago, a study on this treatment was published in the *Bentham Open Stem Cell Journal* and the study outlines the long-term results of this trial. For the 5 years following the procedure, the patient's motor skills improved by over 80 percent for at least 36 months.

Now, a word of caution must be added that since this is a single case study, a larger clinical trial is needed to replicate these findings and assess their long-term sustainability. But notwithstanding, this is an incredible scientific breakthrough.

In 2006, the *Journal of Spinal Cord Medicine* reported a treatment for spinal cord injury using adult stem cells. A doctor in Portugal transplanted nasal stem cells into seven patients with spinal cord injury. Following the procedure, these patients regained some motor function and sensation, and two patients showed bladder control improvement.

I understand that the FDA recently approved a clinical safety trial using human embryonic stem cells for newly injured spinal cord patients. However, it is important to note that this is not a treatment, but only approval to begin experiments with humans to test

for safety. On the contrary, this 2006 study demonstrates actual patient treatment using adult stem cells.

All of these studies show that stem cells can be derived from human cells and used to successfully treat patients, all while maintaining ethical standards. Advancing scientific development and protecting life do not have to be opposing forces.

In just a brief summary, I would like to respond to another question that Congressman SMITH had or suggested he had, and that is that we talk about the Patients First Act, which is a bipartisan bill that was introduced previously. It is now H.R. 877, the Patients First Act, which has been introduced in the 111th Congress. It was originally introduced by Congressman LIPINSKI from Illinois and myself as H.R. 2807.

As we step back, for those of us with loved ones who suffer from these illnesses as I did with my father and I currently do with my brother, it just makes common sense that we would like to do a couple of things.

First of all, we would like to get as much research as we can to the problem, and not just floating out for some hypothetical research. The second thing is we don't want all the theories around, we don't want all the political posturing. What we want is cures in today's time so that we can get them to these patients and they can impact their lives.

So we wrote a bill that did something that is really novel. It used some common sense. It just said what would happen if for a change, instead of worrying about what all of the interest groups wanted, we put the patients first. If you put the patients first, you ask one simple question of the NIH. You simply ask them to do this: Tell us which research, either on the adult stem cells or embryonic stem cells, is going to get the most near-term clinical benefits for the patients, and that is where we want to laser in our money. That is where we want to focus in our money, because that gives us the greatest opportunity for a cure and certainly for treatment.

I am convinced if you do that, right now the scorecard would be 73 for the adult stem cells and zero for the embryonic stem cells. But as Congressman SMITH has so accurately stated, even if you say there is research potential with the embryonic stem cells, there is actually no reason why we couldn't use the IPS cells to do all of that without one bit of ethical problem.

So, Congressman, I just want to tell you tonight in this world of bad news, there is some exciting news out there of what we are seeing. I think patients have reason today to hope if we just do our job and we say let's get off of the divisive debate that has marred this whole area for so long. Let's concentrate on where we can put our research to help patients. In so doing, I think we will end up doing the research with the adult stem cells, and the

promise there I think is really limited now for what our patients will see.

So thank you so much.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thank you to RANDY for his extraordinary contribution and for his leadership on these issues, especially having dealt with and currently dealing with such a difficult hardship with his own family.

I will never forget when Parkinson's disease and fetal tissue transplantation in the mid-1990s was being offered as the panacea, the brass ring, to try to end that very horrible disease, which we all know people, you know it personally in your own family. Unfortunately, we found very quickly that taking fetal tissue from a baby about to be aborted turned out to be an unmitigated disaster as this very unstable group of cells would very quickly proliferate and become various bone tissue and other tissue inside the brain, causing worse convulsions and tremors on the part of the patients in whom the transplantation was given.

I think we have a very similar parallel today where there is an excessive amount of hype and hyperbole about embryonic stem cells, which have an unbelievable propensity, very grave propensity, to become tumors. Not only are they killing embryos to derive the stem cells, but once those stem cells are in hand they become tumors, they are unstable, and, if transplanted into humans, there is a great fear that we would see a replication of the fetal tissue debacle of the mid-1990s.

As you pointed out so well, RANDY, there is an ethical alternative that does not have the rejection factor, will not require anti-rejection drugs, whether it be Celsep or any of these other drugs that those that get transplants get. None of that would happen. And you don't have the tumor formations from these IPS cells.

Mr. FORBES. If the gentleman will just yield briefly and then I will yield right back, one of the things that is so exciting for us as we look in this debate is many of the people that began, the scientists that began doing research on embryonic research have now folded their tent and realize they don't have to do that. They are going back and now saying we don't need to do that. We will use IPS cells or do the adult stems cells.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. As you said, the pioneers of embryonic stem cells are now the pioneers of the ethical IPS.

Mr. JORDAN.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for the comments from our colleague from Virginia too.

I want to just take us a minute to thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his commitment over the years, over the decades, even though you don't look that old, over the decades of standing up for the defenseless, the most vulnerable, for standing up and making a commitment to the truth that all life is precious, it should be

protected, it is sacred, and government has a fundamental responsibility to protect the weak from the strong. That is what Congressman SMITH has done for years, and I am proud to join in that effort, along with other pro-life Members of the United States Congress.

We all want positive treatments to result from stem cell research. We just don't want to destroy human life in getting those treatments. And I thought the gentleman's comments from Virginia were right on target where he talked about the positive results, the positive treatments that have resulted from adult stem cell research. Unbelievable. The scorecard, as the gentleman from Virginia pointed out, is overwhelmingly in favor.

It is interesting, and the gentleman from New Jersey made this point: The ethical decision is the smart decision. The ethical decision is the actual productive decision. It is the one that leads to positive results for families, for people out there, so they can get the treatment they need, and doesn't destroy human life in the process. That is what we should champion. That is the ideal that is consistent with this country that is frankly consistent with our founding.

I always go back to this, and I will close with this and yield back to our pro-life chairman of the Pro-Life Caucus. The document that started it all, and I think it is important to go back to these first principles, the document that started it all in this country, the Declaration of Independence, it is interesting what the Founders said when they said we hold these truths to be self-evident. All are created equal, endowed by our Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

It is always interesting to note the order the Founders placed the rights they chose to mention. Can you pursue happiness, can you go after your goals and your dreams, those things that have meaning and significance to you and your family if you first don't have liberty, if you first don't have freedom? And do you ever experience true liberty, true freedom, if government doesn't protect that most fundamental right, your right to life.

That is what the congressman from New Jersey, Congressman SMITH, has been doing for years, and we appreciate that and we are proud to join in that effort to protect human life and to protect research that is actually going to make sure we protect human life as we move forward and get those positive results that are going to help all kinds of people across this country, around the world, all kinds of families around this country and around the world.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I would just say to my friend, I thank you for your leadership as well. You are new to the Congress. Not that new. You certainly have stepped out time and time again, and it is greatly appreciated by all.

It is interesting that before we have had votes on embryonic stem cell research in this body, Members who take the other view have taken to the floor, to the well of the House, and said things like this, this is from Rahm Emanuel as reported by The Washington Post, I remember when he said it, "It is ironic that every time we vote on this legislation, [embryonic stem cell research, embryo destroying research legislation] all of a sudden there is a major scientific discovery that basically says you don't have to do embryonic stem cell research."

Our good friend and colleague DIANA DEGETTE said, "I find it very interesting that every time we bring this bill up there is a scientific breakthrough."

That is because, Madam Speaker, almost every day there is a scientific breakthrough in the area of adult stem cell and the induced pluripotent stem cells. The skin cells that have been turned into embryo stem cells without destroying or killing an embryo, without the ethical baggage, that is the biggest breakthrough of all. And it seems to me that we should be rejoicing. We have moved beyond the ethical debate because we have something in hand that is the promise and the hope of regenerative medicine.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Well said, Congressman SMITH.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I would like to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. FLEMING.

Mr. FLEMING. Thanks to the gentleman for yielding.

I have put up a quote here which we'll get to in just a moment, and it is on the subject that we are currently discussing about stem cell research. I apologize if some of this is redundant, but I think this new information is very interesting and very exciting and I think it bears perhaps a little important redundancy.

For more than a decade Congress has been debating the ethics of using taxpayer dollars to fund research that requires the destruction of a human embryo. Science is making this debate obsolete.

At the beginning of the embryonic stem cell debate, only 2 years after human embryonic stem cells were first derived, President Clinton's Bioethics Council concluded, and here it is written, that in our judgment, in 1999, the National Bioethics Advisory Commission under President Clinton, said, in our judgment, the derivation of embryos remaining following infertility treatments is justifiable only, that is only if no less morally problematic alternatives are available for advancing this research.

Now, thanks in part to the very same researcher who first discovered how to derive human embryonic stem cells, researchers have discovered how to make pluripotent embryonic-like stem cells without harming or destroying a human embryo.

Let me repeat that. They have discovered a way of creating embryonic-

like stem cells without harming or destroying a human embryo.

You may have heard about these cells. They are called iPSC for induced pluripotent stem cells. They were first discovered in 2007. These cells are made by reprogramming adult cells, such as cells from your skin, into embryonic-like cells.

Of course, just to digress for a moment, to understand what the purpose of this whole idea of stem cells is, it is taking undifferentiated cells, and the future is amazing. We can create organs potentially.

□ 1715

Just think about, in terms of kidneys, hearts or whatever being transplanted. We would have organs that would no longer require any sort of immuno-suppressive drugs.

Anyway, in the 2 years since this technique was first published, hundreds of scientists have been feverishly at work perfecting this technique. Just this week, researchers published a major, just this week now, a major improvement on the technique of creating human iPSC stem cells. You may have read about this in the Washington Post that came out on Monday.

Previously, in order to reprogram cells to their embryonic-like state, researchers relied on viruses which were known to cause cancer when injected into humans. Now, researchers have shown that it is possible to make iPSC stem cells without the harmful virus. In fact, the factors used to reprogram the cells are completely removed, leaving behind only the embryonic-like iPSC stem cells.

So what this means is, not only are we having to use embryonic cells, which means destroying an embryo, a human life, but we can literally take it from the skin of an adult. And even more importantly, we don't have to use viruses to reprogram the nucleus. The problem with viruses, of course, you can introduce all sort of matter into the DNA, such as cancer, which is very dangerous.

These cells are even better than embryonic stem cells from embryos created through IVF because they can both be patient-specific and disease-specific, even for diseases we only barely understand.

Surely this meets the criteria set forth by the Clinton Bioethics Commission. Researchers, funded in part by our own National Institutes of Health, have discovered a viable and promising alternative to destroying embryos for their stem cells. Such research is no longer justifiable, even according to the Clinton criterion, which I've laid out here in large print. And certainly research that is both morally controversial and out of date does not need to be subsidized by the American taxpayer.

So, even in spite of all this, through private means, embryonic stem cell research can still go on, even though it's not needed, as long as taxpayers do not pay for it.

I feel there was never a justification in the past to destroy embryos for the purpose of stem cell research. But now we have two reasons to embrace this new technology, and that is, as I pointed out a minute ago, the fact that it's safer because we don't have to use viruses, and we no longer have to destroy embryos.

So, in closing, Madam Speaker, surely, even those who maintain a pro-abortion position will support this newer, safer technique which requires no Federal dollars to destroy human embryos.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my good friend, Mr. FLEMING, for his contribution and for his leadership. I would like to yield to Mr. BILIRAKIS 3 minutes.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, fellow Members, I'm glad to be on the House floor with you this afternoon discussing this very important topic of adult stem cell therapy. The breakthroughs in technology that have been already discussed, they are exciting, the breakthroughs. And I'm encouraged that science and medical communities are moving toward an ethical approach to treating very sick patients.

This miracle of ethical adult stem cell therapy really hit home with me last month when I met with a Florida cardiologist by the name of Dr. Zannos Grekos, who has been using adult stem cells to treat his very sick cardiopulmonary patients. The doctor has had extraordinary results, and the best part is no embryonic stem cells are used.

Dr. Grekos' groundbreaking procedure involves a simple blood draw which extracts adult stem cells from the patient's own blood. Since it is the patient's own blood, there is no possibility of the body rejecting its own stem cells. The few naturally occurring stem cells in the blood are cultivated into millions of regenocytes. The regenocytes are re-injected back into the patient's heart or blood vessels. They then stimulate tissue re-growth and greater blood flow to the affected area.

This treatment has proven to have miraculous results, and once again, the best part is that embryos are not destroyed and, because regenocytes are extracted from the patient's own blood, they cannot be rejected by the patient's body.

It was reported on CNBC.com a couple of weeks ago that this groundbreaking treatment has successfully treated heart disease, and even helped a patient beat a rare metabolic condition known as Fabry Disease, which would otherwise require a heart transplant.

Madam Speaker, the government should not be in the business of funding destruction of embryonic stem cells. We should be in the business, however, of assisting bright, young, innovative doctors and scientists like Dr. Grekos, who have forged a path of ethical adult stem cell therapy.

I, for one, am excited about the future of this therapy, and encourage this body to do all we can to support ethical adult stem cell therapy.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. BILIRAKIS, thank you so much.

Mrs. BACHMANN.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding.

It's exciting to see what science has wrought just in the last few days, the discoveries that have come about. But the bottom line in all of it is this: Cloning will lead to the exploitation of women. That's harmful and that's not good, especially for poor women in the United States and around the world.

Women's eggs are required in the process of cloning, and the extraction technique exposes otherwise healthy women to the risk of infertility and, sadly, tragically, even of death.

The recent cloning scandal that we've witnessed in South Korea should serve as a warning here to those of us in the United States. Many Korean women were coerced into donating their eggs for Professor Hwang's fraudulent research. Not only is it wrong, really wrong to destroy human embryos, but it's even worse to put women in a position where their health is at risk to do unethical research, especially now, when we find science has taught us we don't have to.

The use of the iPS cells, or the adult stem cells, make it unnecessary to use women's eggs, while researchers who have been pushing human cloning have been seeking them.

We all know that November 20, 2007, a Wisconsin researcher and a Japanese scientist discovered, they independently announced their ability to derive pluripotent stem cells through the reprogramming of regular stem cells. This is a marvelous breakthrough.

And then just days ago, on March 1, 2009, two research teams demonstrated they could reprogram cells without the use of potentially cancer-causing viruses. This is marvelous.

iPS can produce a large number of both patient-specific as well as disease-specific stem cell lines because, according to the Telegraph newspaper, tests on the reprogrammed cell lines showed they behave exactly, exactly like embryonic stem cells. These cells have already been used to make heart muscle, brain neurons, motor neurons, blood, insulin secreting cells.

We are thrilled at the advances that science has made. Let's use these advances to make sure that we can further do more research that will protect people's lives.

But, at the same time, let's not hurt women, let's not destroy their lives, and let's not destroy their fertility; and certainly we shouldn't do anything that should lead to women's death.

And I thank you so much to the gentleman from New Jersey for leading this important hour. Thank you so much.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mrs. BACHMANN, thank you very much for

your leadership and your very eloquent words.

I yield such time as he may consume to Mr. MARK SOUDER.

Mr. SOUDER. I thank my friend, colleague from New Jersey.

I think one of the happiest moments in our life, or any grandparent, is to see your first grandchild. And my grandson, Grant, was born about a year and a half ago to my daughter, Brooke and her husband, Jeff. And we've watched him develop.

But from the time he became an embryo, egg and sperm joined, his stem cell content, his cell content was the same as it is now. All he's added is a little bit of chubbiness and a little bit of height as he's grown.

Now, in about a month our first granddaughter is going to be born, Reagan. And we've watched her grow in the womb. But from the time she was conceived, she became a separate human being. Nothing's really going to change. It's just she's going to grow and she's going to develop personality, add to her intelligence. But she's been the same make-up from the beginning.

Now, the question is, is why are some so intent on taking human life? And why are they so intent in using our taxpayer dollars to make us do that?

We've worked for many years. You've been a stalwart in this. We did a hearing, when we were in the majority, where we showed that there were already scientific breaks occurring in skin cells and so on. And as you said, sometimes the allegation is, why do these breakthroughs come right before we have a big vote?

They come constantly, as you so eloquently said, on lupus, on different diseases. Now we have yet another one. The advances are all in non-embryonic.

So why do we continue, other than because to try to take guilt relief off an abortion, to try to confuse the issue of when human life begins, why do we continue to, quite frankly, waste so much, when, in fact, many people would have been cured, healed and better had we put it into other types of stem cell research other than embryonic?

Thank you for your leadership. And I yield to you for a close.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thank you very much, Mr. SOUDER.

Let me just say in conclusion, Madam Speaker, that the present and the future of regenerative medicine, which holds great promise and hope for each and every one of us, every one of us has members of our own family who have suffered from degenerative diseases, developmental disabilities and the like. We all know the pain and the agony.

I chair or co-chair the Autism Caucus, the Spina Bifida Caucus, the Alzheimer's Caucus, and believe passionately in trying to find cures for diseases. But the future of regenerative medicine is with adult stem cells, including and especially non-embryonic but embryo-like induced pluripotent

stem cells, iPS. That has to become, iPS, a household word.

THE MAJORITY MAKERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. YARMUTH. Madam Speaker, it's a great honor for me to be here tonight to join with many of my colleagues from The Majority Makers, the Class of 2006, which brought change to the Congress, and now hopes to join with President Obama to bring change to the country. We're here tonight to talk about the challenges facing this country that are manifold, the incredible, unprecedented nature of our situation, the opportunities that we face, because every challenge comes with opportunities, and also to talk about the budget that President Obama has proposed to this Congress, because it is a budget that takes us in a very different direction in this country, echoing and reinforcing his theme of his campaign, which was to bring change to the country. And it's also the motivation for all of us who came to Congress in the Class of 2006.

□ 1730

You know, I have the great privilege of serving on the Ways and Means Committee and also on the Budget Committee. Over the last 2 days, we've heard Secretary of the Treasury Timothy Geithner and OMB Director Peter Orszag talking about what the situation is in the country—the economic challenges we in the world face—and also what the Obama administration plans to do about them in asking for our assistance. Two things have been very clear in listening to both of these two gentlemen, who are new to their jobs, in listening to the new administration and also in listening to our colleagues on the other side of the aisle as they're responding to the initiatives of the administration.

The two things are: One, that they like to take potshots at the budget, which is fair game, because this is, after all, sometimes a partisan exercise. Also, the ideas that they bring to the debate are really no new ideas at all. As a matter of fact, listening to Republicans talk about the economic situation and their suggestions for how we move forward is kind of like listening to the coach of the Detroit Lions saying, "hey, use my playbook," after they just went 0 and 16. I don't want to pick on the Detroit Lions, but that's really what it sounds like because they bring no new ideas to the table.

That's what is so impressive about this team that President Obama has assembled and about the budget that he has brought to the Congress and to the American people. It is a budget that is full of new ideas and of new approaches to very old and very difficult problems.

So, as we're here tonight to talk about where we've been and where we're going and where we need to go in this country, I just want to mention the fact that Prime Minister Gordon Brown was here today. The theme of his address to the joint session of Congress was—and he has mentioned the expression many times—"faith in the future." That's really what we're trying to bring to this country, faith in the future, because that faith has been destroyed over the last decade in the United States, and that's what we are so committed to doing, and I think that's what the Obama administration is committed to doing as well, to restoring faith in the future, because that is also what has driven our country, our people, our businesses, and our institutions, which is that we believe there is a better time facing us, a better time ahead, and we have taken those steps. We have worked as hard as we can and have used our ingenuity to realize the future that we all aspire to. So I look forward to the discussion tonight as it's always a pleasure to be with my colleagues.

I would like to yield, first of all, to someone who has been a consistent participant in these discussions we've had, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KLEIN).

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky. Thanks for your leadership on the issues, as we know, we have been really faced with as we move into this next congressional session.

It was interesting. A week ago, most of us were at home, speaking to people in small businesses, speaking to homeowners. Many of us do Congress on Your Corner, which is an idea where we just meet at the local supermarket or local drug store or local 5 and 10 and just have a chance to talk to people about what they're really thinking about right now and how we can solve these problems that our country is looking at. You know, it breaks down into three things:

One is: What can we do to stimulate the economy? What can we do to generate consumer interest and business interest? Because, if we produce more, people will buy more and demand will go up, all those kinds of things. What do we do about the mortgage crisis? It's not just the people who are sort of in foreclosure. There's a very large number of people who are at jobs where maybe they're earning \$50,000.

I was just at a car dealer's the other day, and they were telling me that the owner of the company came to the 140 employees and asked them to vote on whether they wanted to reduce their salaries. He, himself, the owner, had taken no salary in the last year, but he literally asked them if they'd be willing to take less compensation in order to avoid people being laid off. They took a vote and they did it. The reality is someone who's earning \$50,000 may be earning \$40,000 or \$35,000, and someone who is willing or is able to pay \$750

for a mortgage maybe now can afford \$600.

Well, there are simple solutions to that, and I'm very gratified that Congress is moving forward. The Obama administration has put out a number of proposals which, I think, need quick movement because they're just commonsense, and they make sense.

Everyone understands it's not in the best interest of a street for a home to be foreclosed on on that street. The better way to deal with that is to keep that person in the home. If the person is earning a little less than he was earning before, or that \$50,000 to \$35,000, and he can afford \$600 versus \$750, well, it's simple enough. Take the difference and defer it to the end of the mortgage or amortize the mortgage 40 years instead of 30 years. Get the payments to where the person can still afford to stay in the home and can take care of that home and can have a roof over his head. Add value to the community versus having that home boarded up and having it depress every other property on the street.

That's the kind of work that we need to encourage the banks to work on with our local community folks, with our homeowners, and those are some of the proposals that are out on the table today. I think those are the kinds of things that I've been hearing from our communities. We need to know that the government is working on encouraging banks and on finding incentives to get the banks to work with us.

Of course, other than the stimulus, which is already in place—and it's going to begin to filter into the communities over the next number of weeks—the last thing, of course, is fixing the banks in a way that they will lend to small businesses. I know we're going to talk about that tonight because we're a country of small businesses. We understand that's the lifeblood of our communities—to create jobs, to create wealth and to support local communities. I know that there are a number of ideas we're going to discuss which will help get those small businesses back on track because we know that we need to get the banks to help out with that.

So, with that, I'll turn it back to the gentleman. I'm looking forward to this good discussion on how we're going to move forward over the next number of days.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

One of the great things about having these discussions is we get perspectives from all over the country, not just from different, more conservative, more aggressive districts but, rather, geographically and demographically. There are a lot of important perspectives that help shape the context of this discussion.

I would now like to yield to my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ALTMIRE).

Mr. ALTMIRE. I thank the gentleman, and I thank my colleagues for