

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 em-

bryonic 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.