

they can compete on an even keel, on an even playing field.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUHLMAN of New York). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my Special Order at this time.

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

There was no objection.

#### STEM CELL RESEARCH

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak to this Chamber and address the Speaker and the House.

I would like to speak about the embryonic stem cell research that is a matter of discussion around this Congress intensively in the last weeks and months as we have been here. I would like to join some of my colleagues in explaining the progress and promise of adult stem cell research, and I would like to also dispel many of the myths promoted by those urging more Federal funding for the destruction of human embryos required for embryonic stem cell research. I am for stem cell research, adult stem cell research. I am not for ending human life in the process of trying to find a cure for the lives of others.

Among the favorite myths of proponents of embryonic stem cell research is the legend that there are 400,000 embryos stored at IVF clinics that are simply going to be discarded. So we should derive some benefit from them, my opponents say. This figure has become so fixed in their rhetoric that it now seems to be a fact. Members of both Houses, in a letter to President Bush, even cited the number, the 400,000 number, in an effort to get President Bush to change his current policy on the funding of embryonic stem cell research. These proponents then use that number to create the assumption that an equally large number of therapeutic stem cells can be derived from them.

Here is why this argument is wrong, Mr. Speaker: IVF embryos will not just die anyway. Most IVF embryos are designated for implantation, and the rest can be adopted. In 1995 about 500,000 women were seeking to adopt a child. That would be 500,000 families, most of them husbands and wives. Seventy-five

children are alive and well today who started life as frozen embryos.

All of the frozen embryos have the potential to become an independent, well-adjusted human being. Only a small fraction, 2.2 percent, are slated to be discarded. Only another 2.8 percent of embryos in IVF clinics, that is, roughly 11,000, have been designated by their parents for research. That is a total of 6 percent of all the embryos presently in IVF storage that are intended for disposal or research. Only 6 percent. Ninety percent are designated for a future.

More than 90 percent stored in clinics are saved for later use by parents or donated to other infertile couples for implantation. That means of the original 400,000 frozen embryos, only 11,000 are actually available to be destroyed for their stem cells. Of those available embryos, less than 275 stem cell lines would be created. That can be with private sector dollars. It does not have to be dollars extracted from the taxpayer.

When we are asking the taxpayer to contribute money to the Federal Government and diverting those dollars, Mr. Speaker, to go towards embryonic stem cell research, which of necessity must end a human life, and a human life like those 75 children that have come from frozen embryos to childhood and on their way to adulthood, that is an immoral choice, a choice that we are imposing upon tens of millions of people that understand in this country that life begins at the instance of conception; and we cannot declare an embryo, a fertilized egg, that has all of the chromosomes and all the components of an individual little blessing, we cannot declare them to be something of science to be discarded.

And if we roll ourselves back into history, back to the time of the Second World War, the Nazi regime, Dr. Josef Mengele, he did research on people, people who saw more than half of their world population extinguished by the Nazi regime. He did research on people because they were Jewish and put them in chambers and froze them to death and put them in heat chambers to see how much heat they could stand and put them through a whole series of scientific experiments to find out the limitations of the human body, how much suffering could they take, how much weather could they take, how much deprivation of food and water, how much torture could they take, and documented that. And civil societies have refused to use the information and the data that came from the Nazi regime because it resulted in the death of human beings.

This embryonic stem cell research also results in the death of human beings, Mr. Speaker. It is the same kind of philosophy done in the name of science. We can find and have found better and other ways to produce similar and better science. We need to follow that path. There is no legal prohibition against embryonic stem cell research in this country. The debate in

this Congress is about will we impose a tax upon Americans and compel them to dig into their pockets and contribute to this diabolical science that ends the life of an innocent human being for the potential of improving the life of others when we have other alternatives.

Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to join my colleagues in explaining the progress and promise of adult stem cell research and to dispel many of the myths promoted by those urging more federal funding for the destruction of human embryos, required for embryonic stem cell research.

Among the favorite myths of proponents of embryonic stem cell research is the legend that there are 400,000 embryos stored at IVF clinics that are simply going to be discarded, so we should derive some benefit from them. This figure has become so fixed in their rhetoric that it now seems to be a fact. Members of both Houses, in a letter to President Bush, even cited the number in an effort to get President Bush to change his current policy on the funding of embryonic stem cell research. These proponents then use that number to create the assumption that an equally large number of therapeutic stem cells can be derived from them.

Here is why this argument is wrong: IVF embryos will not just "die anyway." Most IVF embryos are designated for implantation, and the rest can be adopted. In 1995, about 50,000 women were seeking to adopt a child. 75 children are alive and well today who started life as "frozen embryos."

Only a small fraction—2.2 percent—are slated to be discarded.

Only another 2.8 percent of embryos in IVF clinics, roughly 11,000, have been designated by their parents for research.

That is a total of 6 percent of all the embryos presently in IVF storage that are intended for disposal or research. More than 90 percent of embryos stored in IVF clinics are saved for later use by parents or donated to other infertile couples for implantation.

That means of the original 400,000 frozen embryos, only 11,000 are actually available to be destroyed for their stem cells.

Of those available embryos, less than 275 stem cell lines would be created. So, behind the seemingly impressive number of 400,000 frozen embryos, the reality is that the actual number of stem cell lines likely to be produced from them is so small as to be clinically useless.

In order to treat diseases—which is, as I will explain, still a very distant prospect using human embryonic stem cells—hundreds of thousands more embryos beyond those currently frozen and available for research would be needed. This could only be achieved by a deliberate effort to create new embryos for the sole purpose of destroying them—an outcome that the use of the frozen embryos is supposed to avoid, but would most likely cause. Federal funding of this destructive embryonic stem cell research would, therefore, create an incentive to create and kill more human embryos for stem cells, which would lead to a US human embryo farm industry.

There is an ethical alternative to killing these embryos: Adult and cord blood stem cells are treating patients of over 58 diseases.

Even if these frozen embryos were going to be discarded anyway (which they are not), and even if there was no ethical alternative