makes things look more controversial than they need to be.

Now, there have recently been some stirrings here. I was very struck when we had a hearing of the Financial Services Committee, the Subcommittee on Oversight, of the strong and articulate voice of the chair of that subcommittee, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY), who objected to the unilateralism of it. There were some other showings in the Senate. Some Senators have said, no, you can't just ignore what the Supreme Court did and you can't just put a little lipstick on this and forget about it.

I wish the administration would understand that what we are talking about is strengthening America, not weakening it; that the democracy we have had, the checks and balances, they weren't suspended during World War II. People made mistakes during World War II, the relocation of the Japanese and others. Yes, those were terrible mistakes, but you had the Truman Committee and you had a very active Congress.

We have not in any previous emergency felt the need to go from the America of our Constitution to a model of a strong man elected and all power ceded to him. And I hope, though I doubt very much this administration plans to change its approach to this, but I hope that what we are seeing now is a willingness on the part of the Congress to assert the constitutional role of the Congress; not to be obstructionist, certainly not for partisanship because the Republicans control both Houses, but in recognition that an America which functions as it was intended to function, in a way in which the branches cooperate and correct each other and improve each other and work together, we are of a common goal, certainly in the area of national security.

We believe, many of us, that a process in which we work together will yield a better result; that a process which assumes that law enforcement is perfect and therefore can operate in secrecy, without any kind of input, that that will do more harm than good compared to what the alternative would be. Not more harm than good overall, but less good than you could otherwise do.

I believe there is a very strong majority in this Congress prepared to work with this administration in ways that preserve the need for discretion and in which the expertise collectively in this body on a number of issues can help us go forward with the measures we need to protect ourselves and, at the same time, preserve our liberties. And if this administration continues the pattern of these past years, it will damage our ability to come together and make this effort, and I think, over the long term, diminish the nature of our democracy, because the democracy of the plebiscite meets minimal democratic standards, but it does not represent the full richness of a democracy in which all can participate.

Now, my last point is this. Especially for this administration, with its focus on the election of the strong man, there needs to be better recognition of the widespread unhappiness about the electoral process. The election of 2000 clearly was a shambles.

Go back to the mob in Florida. You know, we have the man who has been declared to be ahead in Mexico, Calderon, predicting that Obrador, who is challenging the result, will muster a mob and they will march. Well, he might have been describing the Republicans in Florida in 2000, when a mob intimidated people against counting the votes.

And we had a Supreme Court opinion which did not meet the minimum standards, it seems to me, of legitimacy when they said, okay, the Republicans win this one, but please don't pay any attention to this in future races.

Given this administration's view that elections are all you need, it is all the more important for them to understand that we need to reassure the country that elections are fully, fairly conducted. I do not understand why people confident of their mandate, confident of their ability to win would object to some of the things that have been put forward to reassure people that the votes are counted as they are cast.

The worst you could say about that is that it would be a little unnecessary. An administration that spends money the way this one does can't really think that is a financial problem. And we have had examples of votes miscounted. We understand the vulnerability of machines to tinkering. There is no justification for continuing to fail to adopt safeguards for the counting of votes that will reassure people.

Mr. Speaker, the democracy we have had, the checks and balances, the back and forth, Congress being an interference from the standpoint of the executive, in some cases, strong-minded executives, clashing with the President, maybe being fired trying to get support in Congress, a very assertive media, we have had those for a long time, and we are the strongest country in the world. It is very hard to argue from history that these factors weaken us.

What we have is an administration that is radically trying to change the nature of our democracy. They want to simplify it, they want to neaten it. Democracy is not good when it is neat, certainly not in a country as vast as this one. No single individual, no matter how popular, can embody all of the wisdom and all of the values of the country.

The democracy we have evolved of full participation isn't always convenient for those of us in power, it isn't always as quick as people would like, but it has proven over time to be effective, and it could be not only effective today, but even more effective in our collective self-defense than the current model, which produces controversy where none is called for and division where we could have unity.

I am not optimistic that we will change the approach of this administration. But I do hope, Mr. Speaker, that our colleagues in this Congress will continue what I think are stirrings of change and reassert our historic role and restore the kind of messy and inconvenient and much better and more inclusive democracy that has been our country's legacy.

STEM CELL RESEARCH

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

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise on the floor to address an issue that will be in the news a great deal next week. The Congress of the United States has debated on and off for quite a few years the issues surrounding new breakthroughs in cellular treatments for a variety of clinical diseases, and specifically what I am talking about here are stem cell therapies.

The debate that the Congress has been engaged in for some time now is the issue of whether adult stem cells, stem cells taken from my body, or any adult's body, or even a child's body, because they are considered adult stem cells, can more successfully be used to treat a variety of different clinical conditions; or whether cord blood, which is blood from the umbilical cord, or actually you can get stem cells from the placenta, from the cord itself; or whether this notion that has been put forward for quite some time now, that the stem cells taken from an embryo is actually the best hope for the future for treating a whole variety of different diseases, diseases that we today have no treatments for.

I have taken a keen interest in this issue for some time now for a variety of reasons, the first of which being I am a physician. I still see patients about once a month in the veterans clinic in my congressional district. I practiced medicine for 15 years, internal medicine, prior to my election in 1994. I spent many years treating diseases like Parkinson's disease and arthritis and Alzheimer's disease, diseases that we don't have cures for that people often cite as being potentially more successfully treated with embryonic stem cells.

Additionally, I have to say some of these diseases have affected my family. My own father died of complications of diabetes, and an uncle that I was very close to as a small child died of complications of Parkinson's disease. So I consider these arguments very, very personally, I consider them professionally, and I look at the science. I look very, very closely at the science.

Indeed, I think the science overwhelmingly, if you just pause for a

minute and look at the data, clearly, clearly shows that adult stem cells have great promise. Cord blood stem cells have not only great promise, but they are actually being used today. We have cured people with sickle cell anemia, something I would have never thought in my lifetime I would be able to stand up and say that we are curing sickle cell anemia. Cord blood.

Embryonic stem cells, on the other hand, not only have never been successfully used to treat any human condition whatsoever, they have not really been shown to be safe and effective, even in an animal model. Therefore, I find it bizarre and unusual that Members of the Congress would say straight-faced, incredibly, that the embryonic stem cells have more promise and the adult stem cells don't. The data actually suggests the absolute opposite.

And, as I said, the embryonic stem cells actually are very problematic and they have never been proven to be safe. They tend to form tumors, and we don't even have an animal model yet.

□ 1900

Indeed, this issue has become so bizarre it has actually become a campaign issue. I thought it would be good to have a debate and not just have me get up and do a monologue and show slides, but to have some of the Democrat proponents of embryonic stem cell research come to the floor and discuss this issue with me.

One of the big advocates for it is the gentlewoman from Colorado. I asked her to debate me, and she declined. I asked the chairman of the DCCC, Mr. EMANUEL, if he would be willing to come and debate me. He told me he was too busy. I can understand why these people don't want to debate. If you actually look at the science, look at the data, their arguments just don't hold up. There is no ''there'' there.

I would like to just cover perhaps some of the arguments that we would be getting into if they were here. One of them obviously, and I want to do some separating myths from facts, and one of them which we saw a lot of in the past, and you don't see this argument as much but it is still out there, that is the argument that embryonic stem cell research is not allowed or that it is illegal.

In point of fact, it is allowed in the United States. It is not illegal. The argument is should it be funded by the Federal Government.

About a year ago, we took up H.R. 810, a bill that allows U.S. taxpayer dollars to be used for the destruction of human embryos in pursuing embryonic stem cell therapy. I must digress to explain how we got to where we are today. This began back I think it was 1996 when we passed an amendment in the Labor Health and Human Services Appropriations bill, and this was signed by President Clinton, stating that no U.S. taxpayer dollars would be used for any research involving the destruction of a human embryo. We never made it illegal.

The advocates for H.R. 810 in their bill basically say we will now use taxpayer dollars for research that does involve the destruction of a human embryo, essentially overriding the provision that has been in law for some 10 years. And they contend that we need to do this because of the great promise.

I just want to point out that we are already funding embryonic stem cell research, because what happened in the 1990s after President Clinton signed the bill that had the prohibition in it against destructive embryonic research, researchers began to destroy the embryos in outside labs and then send the embryonic stem cells to the NIH, and it was a violation of the spirit of the law if not the legal letter of the law.

One of the things that President Bush did immediately upon coming to office is he reviewed this policy, and he said we are not going to do this any more because clearly in the statute we are not supposed to be funding research that involves the destruction of human embryos. But they had already destroyed some 72 human embryos, and they had 72 cell lines. President Bush said we will allow funding for this research using these existing cell lines because the embryos are already destroyed, but we will not permit the destruction of any more embryos.

Well, H.R. 810, which passed the House of Representatives a year or 9 months ago, would allow Federal funds to be used for the destruction of more embryos to get more of these embryonic stem cell lines. I worked against that bill. I thought that was the wrong thing for us to do based on the simple fact that embryonic stem cells is a bad investment for the taxpayer, and I think it is morally and ethically wrong. But nonetheless on that vote in this body the ''noes'' did not prevail; the ''ayes'' prevailed and we passed it out of the House, and it has been waiting in the Senate.

One of the big reasons I am here tonight is the Senate has finally agreed to take that piece of legislation up. But many of the Members of the Senate who feel the way that I do, that the destruction of human embryos is not something that we should be funding with taxpayer dollars, have proposed a plan to move three bills.

One of the bills is H.R. 810, the Castle-DeGette bill that allows funding for creation of more cell lines using embryonic stem cells. And then there is a second bill which is very exciting that calls for more funding for more research for methods of getting embryonic stem cells without destroying an embryo. Science is moving along so rapidly there is a way to do that.

And a third piece of legislation which is a piece of legislation barring a practice called fetal farming. I have been saying on the floor of this Chamber for years that embryonic stem cell research will not be where they will want to end. These researchers will then want to do something called fetal farming where they start doing research using human fetuses. That is the direction they will go in. They will make the same kinds of arguments that they have made with embryonic stem cell research that they are going to cure this and they are going to cure that, and that is the direction that they are going to go in.

The Senate is going to take up a bill, and I have introduced a bill in the House. They may pass all three of these bills, and we may then take up the ban on fetal farming legislation, my piece of legislation, and a piece of legislation introduced by ROSCOE BARTLETT in the House, the so-called alternatives bill, ways to get embryonic stem cells without destroying human embryos.

I want to say a little bit more about the Bush policy. There were 78 cell lines over at NIH when President Bush came into office. The advocates for H.R. 810 are saying that we need more cell lines; but point of fact, they have only had to use 22 of those.

I also want to point out that there is no bar on private funding for this embryonic stem cell research. Indeed, there are private dollars being used. But what is interesting, the State of California recently had a ballot referendum approving $3 billion worth of research over 10 years on stem cells. So their entire State annual budget will probably exceed what the NIH spends on adult stem cells and embryonic stem cells combined.

And there is research going on in New Jersey and at Harvard, so claims that this Federal ban, so-called Federal ban, and there isn't a ban, we are actually funding it using the cell lines that existed, it is just not true. There is lots of research going on. There is research in California, research in other States, research at private institutions, and there is embryonic stem cell research being funded by the NIH.

What is not being allowed is we are not continuing to use taxpayer dollars for this research because there is an ethical and moral dilemma here. You are destroying a human embryo. Indeed, the NIH last year spent an estimated $40 million on embryonic stem cell research.

Now I want to get a little more into some of the myths and the bogus statements.

One myth is that it is estimated that there are currently about 400,000 frozen IVF embryos which could be used in embryonic stem cell research. Well, it turns out that is not true. And this issue has actually been looked into. The RAND Corporation looked into it.

It turns out that of the 400,000 embryos stored in IVF clinics, and that's the source here, the Castle-DeGette bill, H.R. 810, calls for using the so-called excess embryos at the fertility clinics. When a couple goes in and they want to have a baby and they go to one of these fertility clinics to use in vitro

fertilization, there are often embryos left over. But it turns out that 88.2 percent of the embryos in those clinics are actually wanted by the couples to do future pregnancies. So you don't have 400,000 embryos available.

It also turns out that when you thaw out the embryos, there is a certain mortality. They don't all survive thawing. And at best, it is estimated that 2.8 percent of these, and all of this has been published and I have the publication with me right here, this was published in the Journal of Fertility and Sterility and I can make it available to any Member of the House or Senate who believes there are 400,000 embryos available for research. It is just not true. It turns out there is only a fraction of that number, and at most you would be able to get about 280 more cell lines from using the so-called leftover embryos from the fertility clinics.

Like I said, there are still plenty more cell lines at NIH. This is an unnecessary piece of legislation, and I believe it is unethical.

Another point I want to address is that it has been claimed that the cell lines at the NIH are contaminated by mouse feeder cells. You cannot grow these embryonic stem cells on their own. You have to have a layer of mouse cells growing on a plate, and then you put the embryonic cells in there, and that there is genetic contamination.

And I have the papers with me here. It turns out you can remove all of that so-called contamination and it is really not a problem.

Another point I want to get into is a point which has been made, and maybe I can get some assistance on the next poster here. Thank you.

I have already covered this. This was mentioned by a Member of the other body, that all of these approved lines are now contaminated with mouse feeder cells. I have the publication here. It was published in Nature and Biotechnology. Most embryonic stem cell researchers around the world are using NIH-approved stem cell lines, and they are able to get the mouse feeder cells out of it.

May I have the next poster, please.

This is an important point. It is another point which has been claimed, and that is supposedly because of the so-called Bush ban, and that is the term you often hear them use, the Bush ban, and again there is no Bush ban. Under the Bush policy, there is a ban on killing more embryos, but there is not a ban on embryonic stem cell research, and that we are supposedly falling behind, the United States is no longer the world leader in embryonic stem cell research.

Here again I think the best thing to do is to look at science publications. I have done that. This is a fascinating piece of information. Actually, it really amazed me.

Mr. Speaker, 85 percent of the embryonic stem cell research being done in the world today is using the cells at the NIH, the Bush-approved cell lines, that were derived from embryos that were killed under the Clinton administration. So this claim that, oh, we must have more embryos, we must get these embryos from the fertility clinics, we must extract embryos stem cells from them because the cures are around the corner and we are falling behind, we see that claim, evidence that the United States is no longer the world leader in embryonic stem cell research is mounting. It is just not true.

According to Nature and Biotechnology, in 2006 the U.S. is the world's leader in the number of published stem cell articles generally, and human embryonic stem cell articles specifically. The United States is the world leader.

From 1998 to 2004, the U.S. alone published 46 percent of all papers worldwide on human embryonic stem cells.

□ 1915

In the period from 2002 to 2004, the U.S. increased the number of human embryonic stem cell publications by 700 percent, using the embryonic stem cell lines approved by the Bush policy. So, clearly, that statement that the U.S. is falling behind because of the Bush policy, there is no basis in science, there is no basis in fact to substantiate that.

Now, let me go to the next slide. And this is a very, very interesting point that you often hear made, that adult stem cells have been around for years, and they have an advantage in that the research has been going on for some time. And it is true that adult stem cell transplants have been done for over 20 years, I think over 25 years in humans, and the claim is made that the embryonic stem cells were just discovered in 1998 at the University of Wisconsin. Jamie Thompson discovered them, a researcher, and he didn't really discover them. Everybody knew they were there. What he was able to do was successfully extract them and grow them in a dish.

But it turns out, and here again, this was published in a scientific journal, embryonic stem cells, animal embryonic stem cells have been used for 25 years, 25 years, embryonic stem cells research in animals. And the most interesting thing about this is that they have never been shown in that 25-year period to be safe and effective in the treatment in animals. What is lacking in this whole debate is an animal model. You cannot take a diabetic rat or a diabetic mouse and do an embryonic stem cell transplant and cure that animal of its diabetes. Twenty-five years.

And the other critical thing is, embryonic stem cells form tumors. And actually it is interesting to note, that is one of the ways scientists demonstrate or validate that they actually have embryonic stem cells. They will take the embryonic stem cells, or what they think is an embryonic stem cell line that they have extracted from an embryo, an animal embryo, and they will inject it into the animal. They will inject it in the mouse, and if it forms a tumor, it is a certain kind of tumor called a teratoma, then they know it is an embryonic stem cell. And before you can ever use something like that in a human you have to turn off that ability to form a tumor to show that it is safe, and it has never been done. They have never demonstrated, in 25 years, that they can cure an animal of a disease and show that it can be done safely.

Now, might I digress for a minute, just to say that adult stem cells have been shown to be safe? Adult stem cells have been shown to treat a whole host of conditions. Indeed, I have had people come to my office who have gotten cord blood transplants, who have gotten adult stem cell transplants and have been cured of diseases. I mentioned sickle cell anemia earlier. I had a young lady who had paralysis, and with adult stem cell therapy, she can't walk, but she is able to stand up. She came in my office. I have a picture of her doing that. That kind of research has been published. And so it is just fascinating when you actually start looking at the science here.

And now, I want to get into the issue of where is the American public on this issue, and maybe we can get the next one up there. One of the things that is often claimed by the advocates for H.R. 810, the Castle-DeGette language, is the American people really want this.

Now, one of the advocates on the Republican side of the aisle that has been advocating for an overturning of the Bush policy and more funding, that involves destroying human embryos, because they know that we are already funding embryonic stem cell research.

The Winston Group did a poll, and it showed, supposedly, and this is the myth, that Republican voters support expanding embryonic stem cell research by a margin of 55–38. And that was published by the Main Street Partnership, which is a Republican group that has been advocating, they have been involved in the efforts to pass the Castle-DeGette legislation.

It turned out that in that same poll, they then asked those Republican voters, if they knew that it involved the destruction of an embryo, what would happen? And 64 percent said they were less favorable. In other words, you went from a 55–38 in favor of it, and when you revealed to them that this research involves, essentially, the killing of a human embryo, 64 percent changed their mind. They changed their position.

Another myth. Every poll shows the dominant majority of Americans support embryonic stem cell research. Facts are stubborn things. Congress is considering the question of Federal funding of experiments using stem cells from human embryos. The live embryo would be destroyed in the first week of development to obtain these cells.

Do you support or oppose using your Federal tax dollars for such experiments? That is the right question you have got to ask the American people. Well, here are the numbers. When you ask them the right question, 38.6 percent say they support that; 47.8 percent say they oppose it.

Now, granted this is not a majority. But this is certainly not a majority. It is a fallacy to say that a majority of Americans support funding research involving the destruction of human embryos. It is just not true.

One of the other myths that you often hear is that therapies are around the corner. I alluded to this earlier. Before you can say human embryonic stem cell therapy is around the corner, somebody has to develop an animal model that shows that it works and it is safe before you could try it in a human, and they have yet to do that. They have just been unable to do that.

The other thing I want to get at is another myth, stem cell research, whether it is done with embryonic stem cells or adult stem cells, needs cloning research to make it work. And that was said in a debate in previous years by a former Member of the Congress who now heads the Biotechnology Industry Organization, or BIO, as they call it.

I think Congressman GREENWOOD, at the time, was partially right. Embryonic stem cell proponents will need to clone, if they ever have a hope of using embryonic stem cells for human therapies. And the reason for that is to get over the issue of tissue rejection. You can't take an embryo from a fertility clinic and extract stem cells from it and give it to somebody else who is sick. They will reject the tissue, whereas with adult stem cells where you take it from the patient, you take nasal cells or you take bone marrow cells, you convert those in the tissue that you need and you put them back in the patient, there is no issue of tissue rejection.

And so the only way that embryonic stem cell research would ever work, and so he was partially correct in what he said, is that you would have to do cloning. And that is where these two issues come together.

A lot of people will ask me the question, what is the relationship between cloning and embryonic stem cell research? It is a very simple one. Adult stem cells work because there are no, well, they work, first of all. Embryonic stem cells have never been shown to work. But adult stem cells can work because there are no issues of tissue rejection.

But when you talk about using embryonic stem cells from a fertility clinic, it is somebody else's cells. You are going to reject those tissues. You are going to have to take immunosuppressive drugs your entire lifetime unless, of course, you made a clone of that person, and then the belief is that you would not get tissue rejection. Actually, scientific research suggests that you would still, nonetheless, get tissue rejection.

Well, here, I think, is a poster that basically says it all. Adult stem cell research, well, this is from a year ago actually on the top here. They had 58 different diseases, human diseases. These are sick people. I am not talking about treating rats or mice, monkeys. I am talking about human beings. A year ago we had 58 published in the scientific literature, different clinical conditions treated successfully.

Now, they are not all cures. There is a guy who was treated with an adult stem cell transplant for Parkinson's disease. He still has a little bit of Parkinson's disease. But he is off of most of his medicines, he is able to walk, talk, feed himself much better. He is 80 percent better.

And so I want to be honest. They are not all 100 percent cures, but 58, successful therapies; zero with embryonic stem cells. That was May of 2005. May of 2006, 72, so in 1 year's time, it is almost one, a little more than one a month I see, I look at these studies, I comb the research literature. It is a little more than one a month new clinical diseases successfully treated with adult stem cells and cord blood stem cells. And, of course, embryonic stem cells, still no therapies. Amazing.

And what is really interesting behind this figure, it is not 72 people. It is thousands of people that have been treated. There are some of these treatments that are being used constantly, and yet we don't have a single one using embryonic stem cells.

And this is the part that I don't understand about the debates here in this Congress. As I said, I am a doctor, and when I see these kinds of, you know, a lot of times we debate reality here. We debated a few weeks ago whether we should pull out of Iraq. I mean, that is a real honest debate. The soldiers are there. The war is going on. Are we going to pull out or whether we are going to stay.

But to debate that we need to fund more of this research claiming that we don't fund it, when, in reality we fund it, and to claim that it is more promising when there is absolutely no evidence of that, the opposite is the case. The adult stem cells, the cord blood stem cells; and those don't involve destroying human embryos, and Americans are just not comfortable with that.

Now, I said earlier in my introduction that there will be three bills taken up over in the Senate. One of them is this Castle-DeGette bill, which will allow the creation of more cell lines, destroying more human embryos, even though we don't need more cell lines, even though we are leading the world in research. Even though the embryonic stem cell research appears to be going nowhere, the adult and cord blood stem cell research is showing more promise, they want to kill more embryos. And that is how H.R. 810 passed this body.

It is probably going to pass the Senate. Most of the Senators, I assume, do not read the medical literature. They just accept these arguments at face value, that embryonic stem cells are more promising. So they will, the discussion is that they will approve that bill.

But they are going to take up, and I am glad the Senate is going to be doing this, two other bills. One of them is a bill, a piece of legislation involving more research on alternatives to developing embryonic stem cells. And I think this is very exciting. See, most of the people who want to do embryonic stem cell research are not clinicians like me. Not doctors. They are Ph.D researchers, bench researchers, and they want to study the science of this. They want to publish papers, that science can ultimately be used, maybe to better understand diseases.

□ 1930

I do not take that away. I think there is some validity to that argument. The reason I do not support H.R. 810, though, is because we have embryonic stem cells available through the NIH where they can fund the research. We have private entities willing to fund dollars to be used to kill, destroy more embryos so that you can get more embryonic stem cells. We just don't need to be using Federal tax dollars for this.

But what is really exciting is there is a multitude of evidence emerging that you can take adult stem cells and treat them and get them to behave like embryonic stem cells. One of the most exciting groups that has approached me about this issue is a group in California that is using testicular cells, and they appear to be able to get them to do all the things that embryonic stem cells can do. And some of this is making it to the literature, Nature Magazine, which is a scientific publication, just published last week, and the title was ''A Simple Recipe Gives Adult Stem Cells Embryonic Powers. Reprogramming adult stem cells to repair damaged tissues may not be quite as tough as thought. Researchers have devised a chemical cocktail that makes adult mass cells behave like embryonic stem cells, and the recipe is surprisingly simple.''

So the science is moving us in a direction where we do not need, basically, to kill human embryos to do this kind of research. We can create embryonic stem cells from testicular cells. We can create embryonic stem cells. Really using this evidence from this report in Nature, you can use adult stem cells. So very, very exciting things going on.

And I just want to point out that I am not the only person talking about this. If I can get the next slide here, this was at a hearing about 2 or 3 weeks ago in the other body. The committee chairman asked, Would you say, then, that embryonic stem cells are the best available, although all others

ought to be pursued? So he was basically asking the question, we should do adult stem cell research, cord blood stem cell research, but wouldn't you say that the embryonic stem cells are the best available?

And this was a question to Dr. James Battey. He is the director of the NIH Stem Cell Task Force. So this is the man who oversees the peer review panels that look at all the applications for stem cell research, and these are the folks that approve funding, and they fund cord blood stem cell research. They fund adult stem cell research, and they are funding embryonic stem cell research and providing the cell lines, the NIH-approved cell lines, to the researchers.

And this is what he said. It is an amazing quote: ''To me the very most interesting thing is this frontier area of nuclear reprogramming where you take a mature adult cell type and you effectively dedifferentiate it back to a pluripotent state.''

He is saying, and this is, I think, the man who should be the most knowledgeable on this level of research throughout the world, is that you do not need embryos. You do not need to destroy embryos. You don't have to use taxpayer dollars for the destruction of human life. This is the exciting area, nuclear reprogramming, where you can take an adult stem cell and basically get it to behave like an embryonic stem cell.

Might I just say as an aside, while Dr. Battey is very excited about this and I think it is going to bear fruit and there are going to be a lot of Ph.D. theses written using these kinds of cells, I do not think they will ever be useful in any medical treatments. I may be wrong. They may prove to be very useful. And that is because the adult stem cells are proven to be very, very useful now. I mean, there are some four, five, six different clinical trials under way now, as we speak, using adult stem cells used to treat congestive heart failure, one of the most common heart conditions that we see in the United States. Thousands of people in the United States die every year from it. And I seriously question if the embryonic stem cells would ever prove to be any better than the adult stem cell therapies that are currently under way and are being used in research.

I want to talk just a little bit more before I close about this issue of fetal farming, and why did I introduce a bill to ban fetal farming; why is that going to be introduced in the Senate. And we may not actually take up my bill, though it is identical to the Senate bill. The Senate may approve the ban on fetal farming that, I think, Senator SANTORUM has introduced, the same bill.

Why do I want to go in this direction? Well, if you look at the scientific literature, it appears as though that is the direction some researchers want to go, and that is where they are not doing research involving human embryonic stem cells. They are now implanting human embryos either in an animal or in a human being and then extracting stem cells or tissue from the fetus.

And why am I concerned about this? Well, here is a study. I think this one involved cows. It was published back in 2002. They took a cow embryo. Actually, they took a cow egg and they did cloning. They created a cloned cow. They put that cow cloned into another cow, and then they extracted the cloned cow fetus from the mother cow and they got tissue out of it, and they used the tissue to do a tissue transplant.

Then there was another study, and I think this will be the last poster that I will put up, and this is another cow study where they did the same thing. They were looking to get fetal liver, and they were successful in doing that; and it was published in July of last year, where they are taking either clones or embryos that are created through sexual fertilization, and they are putting it in a cow. They are letting it develop for 6 months, and then they are taking tissue out to get stem cells.

That is the direction I feel that some researchers will want to go in, and I think that should not be allowed in humans. I think it is repugnant. It is revolting. So I have introduced legislation to ban doing that in humans. And the legislation, which is the Fetal Farming Prohibition Act of 2006, I believe, will pass the Senate. I believe it will pass the House. And, hopefully, the President will be signing it.

Hopefully, he will be signing the alternatives research bill. I think we should be putting more money into ways to develop embryonic stem cells without having to kill an embryo, and certainly that would satisfy all of these researchers who want to do this research.

The President has indicated that if the Senate passes the Castle-DeGette bill, H.R. 810, that his intention is to veto it, and I certainly support him in that. I hope he does do that because it is the wrong thing to do morally and ethically. There are millions of American taxpayers who will be seeing their tax dollars used to destroy a human embryo. I am against that. They are against that. We should let the private sector fund that. The private sector will not fund it because it is probably research that is not going to go anywhere. The President should veto it. I believe we can sustain the veto. This is the right thing to do morally. This is the right thing to do ethically. It is also the right thing to do with the taxpayer dollars.

I put the poster up earlier showing all the treatments with adult stem cells and how embryonic stem cells have never been shown to be safe and effective even in an animal model, and why should we be using taxpayer dollars to fund this research when so many people find it repugnant and, as well, it has never been demonstrated to be effective.

So this will be an issue. It will be in the news next week. The Senate will take it up first, then the House. We have already passed H.R. 810. We will pass, hopefully, the ban on fetal farming and the alternative bill, and then all three bills will go to the President. Hopefully, he will sign the alternatives research bill and the ban on fetal farming; and, hopefully, he will veto the Castle-DeGette bill. Of course, if he does that, the Senate may override his veto. I certainly hope the House sustains his veto. It is the smart thing to do and it is the right thing to do.

So with that I end my discussion on this issue, and I am looking forward to the debate next week and participating in it.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. SLAUGHTER (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. TIAHRT (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of attending a funeral.

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of personal reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. HERSETH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OWENS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RAHALL, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of North Carolina) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BILIRAKIS, for 5 minutes, July 20.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, July 17, 18, 19, and 20.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 96. Concurrent resolution to commemorate, celebrate, and reaffirm the national motto of the United States on the 50th anniversary of its formal adoption; to the Committee on the Judiciary.