

Keller	Murtha	Scott (GA)
Kelly	Musgrave	Scott (VA)
Kennedy (MN)	Myrick	Sensenbrenner
Kennedy (RI)	Nadler	Serrano
Kildee	Napolitano	Sessions
Kilpatrick (MI)	Neal (MA)	Shadegg
Kind	Neugebauer	Shaw
King (IA)	Ney	Shaqs
King (NY)	Norwood	Sherman
Kingston	Nunes	Sherwood
Kirk	Nussle	Shimkus
Kline	Oberstar	Shuster
Knollenberg	Obey	Simmons
Kolbe	Olver	Simpson
Kucinich	Ortiz	Skelton
Kuhl (NY)	Osborne	Slaughter
LaHood	Otter	Smith (NJ)
Langevin	Owens	Smith (TX)
Lantos	Oxley	Smith (WA)
Larsen (WA)	Pallone	Smith (WA)
Larson (CT)	Pascarell	Snyder
Latham	Pastor	Sodrel
LaTourette	Paul	Solis
Leach	Payne	Souder
Lee	Pearce	Spratt
Levin	Pelosi	Stark
Lewis (CA)	Pence	Stearns
Lewis (GA)	Peterson (MN)	Strickland
Lewis (KY)	Peterson (PA)	Stupak
Linder	Petri	Sullivan
Lipinski	Pickering	Sweeney
LoBiondo	Pitts	Tancredo
Lofgren, Zoe	Platts	Tanner
Lowe	Poe	Tauscher
Lucas	Pombo	Taylor (MS)
Lungren, Daniel	Pomeroy	Taylor (NC)
E.	Porter	Terry
Lynch	Price (GA)	Thomas
Mack	Price (NC)	Thompson (CA)
Maloney	Pryce (OH)	Thompson (MS)
Manzullo	Putnam	Thornberry
Marchant	Radanovich	Tiaht
Markey	Rahall	Tiberi
Marshall	Ramstad	Tierney
Matheson	Rangel	Towns
Matsui	Regula	Turner
McCarthy	Rehberg	Udall (CO)
McCaul (TX)	Reichert	Udall (NM)
McCollum (MN)	Renzi	Upton
McCotter	Reyes	Van Hollen
McCrery	Reynolds	Velázquez
McDermott	Rogers (AL)	Visclosky
McGovern	Rogers (KY)	Walden (OR)
McHenry	Rogers (MI)	Walsh
McIntyre	Rohrabacher	Wamp
McKeon	Ros-Lehtinen	Wasserman
McMorris	Ross	Schultz
McNulty	Rothman	Waters
Meehan	Roybal-Allard	Watson
Meek (FL)	Royce	Watt
Meeks (NY)	Ruppersberger	Waxman
Melancon	Rush	Weiner
Mica	Ryan (OH)	Weldon (FL)
Michaud	Ryan (WI)	Weldon (PA)
Millender-	Ryun (KS)	Weller
McDonald	Sabo	Westmoreland
Miller (FL)	Salazar	Wexler
Miller (MI)	Sánchez, Linda	Whitfield
Miller (NC)	T.	Wicker
Miller, Gary	Sanchez, Loretta	Wilson (NM)
Miller, George	Sanders	Wilson (SC)
Mollohan	Saxton	Wolf
Moore (KS)	Schakowsky	Woolsey
Moore (WI)	Schiff	Wu
Moran (KS)	Schmidt	Wynn
Moran (VA)	Schwartz (PA)	Young (AK)
Murphy	Schwarz (MI)	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—8

Davis (FL)	Inslee	McKinney
Evans	Issa	Northup
Gutierrez	McHugh	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1657

Mr. LEVIN changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds of those voting having responded in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the resolution was amended so as to read: “Resolution condemning in the strongest possible terms the July 11, 2006, terrorist attacks in India and expressing condolences to the families of the victims and sympathy to the people of India.”.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STEM CELL RESEARCH ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2005—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 109-127)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUHLMAN of New York) laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith without my approval H.R. 810, the “Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act of 2005.”

Like all Americans, I believe our Nation must vigorously pursue the tremendous possibilities that science offers to cure disease and improve the lives of millions. Yet, as science brings us ever closer to unlocking the secrets of human biology, it also offers temptations to manipulate human life and violate human dignity. Our conscience and history as a Nation demand that we resist this temptation. With the right scientific techniques and the right policies, we can achieve scientific progress while living up to our ethical responsibilities.

In 2001, I set forth a new policy on stem cell research that struck a balance between the needs of science and the demands of conscience. When I took office, there was no Federal funding for human embryonic stem cell research. Under the policy I announced 5 years ago, my Administration became the first to make Federal funds available for this research, but only on embryonic stem cell lines derived from embryos that had already been destroyed. My Administration has made available more than \$90 million for research of these lines. This policy has allowed important research to go forward and has allowed America to continue to lead the world in embryonic stem cell research without encouraging the further destruction of living human embryos.

H.R. 810 would overturn my Administration’s balanced policy on embryonic stem cell research. If this bill were to become law, American taxpayers for the first time in our history would be compelled to fund the deliberate destruction of human embryos. Crossing this line would be a grave mistake and would needlessly encourage a conflict between science and ethics that can only do damage to both and harm our Nation as a whole.

Advances in research show that stem cell science can progress in an ethical way. Since I announced my policy in 2001, my Administration has expanded funding of research into stem cells that can be drawn from children, adults, and

the blood in umbilical cords with no harm to the donor, and these stem cells are currently being used in medical treatments. Science also offers the hope that we may one day enjoy the potential benefits of embryonic stem cells without destroying human life. Researchers are investigating new techniques that might allow doctors and scientists to produce stem cells just as versatile as those derived from human embryos without harming life. We must continue to explore these hopeful alternatives, so we can advance the cause of scientific research while staying true to the ideals of a decent and humane society.

I hold to the principle that we can harness the promise of technology without becoming slaves to technology and ensure that science serves the cause of humanity. If we are to find the right ways to advance ethical medical research, we must also be willing when necessary to reject the wrong ways. For that reason, I must veto this bill.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 19, 2006.

□ 1700

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and the veto message and the bill will be printed as a House document.

The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this question.

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

There was no objection.

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

The President today used the veto authority for the first time in his Presidency. Yesterday Congress sent him two bills relating to emerging medical research involving the use of so-called stem cells. Today the President signed one of those bills while vetoing a second. A third bill was supported by a majority of House Members last night, but did not capture the necessary two-thirds vote to be passed under the suspension of the rules.

The bill signed into law by the President today is a positive step forward, and I remain hopeful that we can reconsider the other measure at some point in the future. Our colleagues, ROSCOE BARTLETT, PHIL GINGREY, NATHAN DEAL, and DAVE WELDON, deserve great credit for their hard work on these two measures. Their work brings

new hope in the struggle to find cures that have eluded medical researchers for decades as they search for ways to defeat serious disease.

The President's decision to veto the legislation offered by my friend from Delaware Mr. CASTLE should come as no surprise to anyone. More than a year ago President Bush warned the bill would take us across a critical ethical line by creating new incentives for the ongoing destruction of emerging human life. Crossing this line, the President said, would be a great mistake.

As the President also noted a year ago, there really is no such thing as a "spare embryo." Every man and woman in this Chamber began life as an embryo identical to those destroyed through the process known as embryonic stem cell research. The embryos at issue in this debate are fully capable of growing and being born as healthy babies with loving parents. The notion that embryonic stem cell research relies on "spare embryos" that have no value beyond the possibilities for medical research is tragically and deceptively wrong.

Many opponents of the President's decision today are driven by a passion for the preservation of human life and the desire to see developments of cures to chronic diseases. I have great respect for their commitment to this goal, and I think it is a goal that we all share. The passion for the preservation of human life is incomplete if that passion does not extend to the most vulnerable form of human life.

It is wrong to force Americans to allow their tax dollars to subsidize medical research that depends on this destruction of human embryos. The Congress sent the President a bill that would expand the use of Federal tax dollars for this practice, and the President rightly used his veto power to reject it.

Because the vetoed bill originated in the House, the Constitution gives us the duty of receiving the President's veto message and initiating any legislative response. Having now been notified of the President's action, the House will now immediately consider the question of whether to override the President's veto, which would require a two-thirds vote, or to sustain it.

For the reasons I have just articulated, I would urge my colleagues to join me in voting against the motion to override. No just society should condone the destruction of innocent life, even in the name of medical research. The President was right to veto this bill. It would be wrong for this House to overrule the President's decision by voting to override.

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

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, today the President of the United States has snuffed out the candle of hope for 110 million Americans who suffer from debilitating dis-

eases like diabetes, Parkinson's, Alzheimer's, nerve damage and many, many more. He snuffed out this candle of hope because he used the first veto of his 6-year Presidency to veto H.R. 810, the embryonic stem cell legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this is the President's first veto in over 1,100 bills. The President issued veto warnings in nearly 150 bills, but he signed all of those bills. The President has signed bills to increase the national debt. He has signed bills to increase tax cuts for wealthy corporations and oil companies. He signed hundreds of post office naming bills, but he decided he would veto this one bill. This is not some minor legislation. This is legislation that would foster the only research that has shown hope for millions of Americans.

He said in his veto message that he was vetoing this legislation because "American taxpayers would be compelled to fund the deliberate destruction of human embryos." One might think that the President would read this bill, his first veto, before he said that, because if he had read that bill, he would know that H.R. 810 specifically does not allow Federal funds to be used for the destruction of embryos. Rather, H.R. 810 says that Federal dollars can be used for the research on embryonic stem cell lines which have already been created with private dollars.

This policy is the same as the policy President Bush looked at in 2001 when he issued an executive order restricting the number of stem cell lines used. What he said at that time was embryonic stem cell research was okay, but he limited it to embryonic stem cell lines in existence as of that day.

So I ask the President, why is it wrong to simply expend Federal money for stem cell lines that have been created by private researchers since that date? It seems wrong, and it is certainly not what this bill is intended to do.

The President wants it both ways. He wants to say that he supports embryonic stem cell research, but he doesn't want to do it in a way that will actually effect cures.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the President is confused about his role as chief executive of this country. We don't live in a theocracy. We live in a constitutional democracy in this country where we form a consensus about ethics and medical research. There is a widespread consensus. The public supports this almost three-quarters. Pro-life, pro-choice, Democrat, Republican, Independent, all of them share the same concern that we protect lives, but that we expand research in a way that will benefit millions and millions of Americans.

I urge this House to take this very seriously. Don't make a political vote. Think about the lives that could be saved. Think about what H.R. 810 actually does, and vote "yes" to override this veto.

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the sponsor of the underlying bill, the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE).

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished majority leader very much for yielding.

I would just ask everybody, be they at home or here, look to your left and look to your right. There is one of those three people who probably has some form of illness which could be helped by good medical research, and we believe that is embryonic stem cell research.

It is ironic that the President is vetoing a piece of legislation that many of us here on this floor believe is the most significant piece of legislation that he could have signed in the course of time that he has been President of the United States of America. I am disappointed in that, but I would rather look at the bright side of things in the sense that we have advanced, I believe, the cause of medical research in this country.

We have had alternative proposals in terms of embryonic stem cell research. We have had a focus on it. There is a greater education about stem cell research than we ever had in this Congress before and certainly across the United States of America. Hopefully this will end up with greater research being done as far as the NIH and Federal medical involvement in that research is concerned.

The debate has sort of shifted. Back in May of 2005 when we had this debate, we talked about adult stem cells and how they could be better than embryonic stem cells. I think we all should recognize that there is some very good research on adult stem cells, which has been around for a long time, but we should realize now that the debate has turned to how are we going to obtain these pluripotent embryonic stem cells which can help research so much more than anything else we could possibly do. So there had been some progress as far as that is concerned.

A couple of points I want to make, and one is that everybody knows this research is about embryos. What is an embryo? It is a 5-day-old blastocyst no bigger than the point of a pencil. The ones that we are dealing with would never be implanted in a woman and are slated for medical waste. That is very important to understand. The decision has been made by the individuals who created that embryo to have it go into medical waste; and then they make the decision instead of doing that, it will be used for medical research. So these will never become people because that is a decision that has already been made and is behind us at that particular point in time.

It is also very important to point out that this legislation does not fund derivation or the so-called killing of the embryo to obtain the embryonic stem cells. That has nothing to do with this.

This simply funds the research, the potentially life-saving research, for the one in three, the 110 million Americans who have been referred to.

We are not going to stop here. I would just like to address those 110 million people and their families. We are not going to stop here. We are going to continue to advance research. We have offered alternatives to the White House before. They did not want those alternatives. They did not want this legislation. We will go back to that process. We will do everything in our power to help the patients nationwide who might need help.

I think there is more commonality of opinion on this than there was before. Hopefully there will be more openings than we have had heretofore as well.

I know that embryonic stem cell research will progress and eventually be a benefit to mankind. My concern is delay. It is going to happen at some point. It is a time issue. It is a temporal issue, but we are going to have this research. We are going to improve medical research opportunities for everybody.

I just want to quote Ben Franklin at the 1787 Constitutional Convention: "I have often in the course of the session looked at that sun behind the President without being able to tell whether it was rising or setting. But now at length I have the happiness to know it is a rising and not a setting sun."

That is how I feel about stem cell research: One day the sun will rise on it, and people will be helped.

□ 1715

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO).

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I thank our distinguished colleague who has worked so hard to bring this legislation forward.

Today, I think, is really a sad day in our country with the President announcing the veto, the only veto that he has used in his entire Presidency, to strike down what I believe is very sound legislation. I think he has placed the dogmatic views of some of his supporters ahead of sound science, ahead of public health, ahead of research, and ahead of our country's best interest.

I am proud to be an original cosponsor of the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act. Why? Because there are millions of Americans that are afflicted with so many diseases. I believe that this legislation not only gives them hope, it spells out, as a national policy, that we can indeed merge ethics, morality, and sound public policy to address what ails them.

We have all had constituents come to us, parents of children with juvenile diabetes, pleading that the research be able to go forward.

I have always thought that America was the best idea that has ever been born. Today, I think that light of what America represents not only to her own people, but to be the hope and the

beacon of light for people around the world, has been diminished by this veto.

I believe that this legislation needs to move on. It should be the public policy and the guidepost in terms of ethics and morality for our country, which is the responsibility of the Congress to set forward, should move forward, and it will when the House of Representatives overrides the President's dubious veto.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately the President has placed the dogmatic views of some of his supporters ahead of sound science, ahead of public health, and ahead of our country's best interests.

The Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act will not merely advance medical science. It will almost certainly save many thousands of lives and provide hope to millions of Americans afflicted with terrible, debilitating diseases and injuries, including Parkinson's, Alzheimer's, spinal cord injuries, strokes, heart disease, diabetes, burns and arthritis.

I'm proud to be an original cosponsor of this bill and I'm deeply saddened that the President has seen fit to use the first veto of his presidency on this crucial legislation.

H.R. 810 will bring embryonic stem cell research under the National Institutes of Health, ensuring rigorous controls and ethical guidelines on this research that only the NIH can implement.

Congress has a moral imperative to frame these issues and establish a national policy that integrates the best of science and the highest ethical standards.

Without this legislation, much of the critical funding for stem-cell research will be available only from the States, from private sources, or from foreign governments who are investing billions in this field.

If we don't override the President's veto, stem cell research will be curtailed in the United States, but it will not end. Researchers and doctors in the United Kingdom, Sweden, Israel, China, Australia, South Korea, the Czech Republic, and elsewhere are moving full speed ahead on this vital research and will continue to do so.

If the President's veto of this bill is successful, he will only succeed in preventing life-saving cures from reaching American patients sooner, and prevent the establishment of national standards for this research.

Mr. Speaker, science and ethics can and indeed should be joined, and this legislation sets out a comprehensive national policy for this vital research.

The President's veto represents an exercise of political science over real science, and must not be allowed to stand.

Vote to override this veto.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that there has been so much confusion about the current state of embryonic stem cell research in our country. The choice is not between conducting the stem cell research or not conducting it. That is not the choice. Embryonic stem cell research is legal in America, and nothing in the administration's current policy affects that legality; 400 lines are currently

being used to conduct embryonic stem cell research, both in the private sector and by the Federal Government. Indeed, the Federal Government spent \$41 million last year on embryonic stem cell research.

The administration's policy simply provides that Federal taxpayer dollars are not used to destroy human embryos. It is false to suggest that medical breakthroughs come only through government research. In fact, the private sector has been responsible for such breakthroughs as the heart drug Sildenafil, Prozac and ibuprofen. Private researchers discovered penicillin and the polio vaccine, conducted the first kidney and lung transplants, and identified the role DNA plays in directing our biologic makeup, all without Federal dollars.

And where is the private sector spending its dollars now? The overwhelming portion of nongovernment money is going to adult and germ cell research, because that is where the promise is. There are over 72 known treatments using adult stem cells. A huge breakthrough with regard to juvenile diabetes has occurred just in the last 6 months. Ductal cells from the patient's own pancreas can be induced to become stem cells that then produce insulin-producing cells. This process was created in the U.S. and has cured eight people of diabetes in Europe using adult stem cells, not embryonic stem cells.

But, Mr. Speaker, no one can deny that this debate involves a profound ethical and moral question. This is a matter of conscience for millions of taxpayers who are deeply troubled by the idea that their resources are being used to destroy human life, and it is a vote of conscience for me.

The private sector can go forward, if it must, with destruction of embryos for questionable and ethically challenged science. But spend the people's money on proven blood cord, bone marrow, germ cell, and adult cell research.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), a leader on this issue.

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for her exceptional leadership, along with Congressman MIKE CASTLE's leadership on this exceptional and important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to express profound disappointment in the decision of the President to veto H.R. 810.

This legislation passed with strong bipartisan support in both Chambers of Congress. It enjoys the support of upwards of 70 percent of the American people and, most importantly, it offers hope and the promise of a cure to the millions of people who are living with the constant challenge and burdens of chronic disease and disability.

Mr. Speaker, when I was injured in an accidental shooting as a young police cadet almost 26 years ago, I was told that I would never walk again. The promise of embryonic stem cell research was at that time unheard of.

While I always held out hope that I would one day walk again, it was not until the tremendous potential and advances in the field of stem cell research that I truly understood how a cure might work. Today I am thrilled to be able to share this hope with millions of others.

We live in exciting times. Today, newly injured patients, many of them teenagers, as I was, are told about developing treatments and scientific progress. They face the world with many of the same challenges I faced in 1980, but they also face the world with the hope and real promise of a cure.

Under the current policy, however, that promise is limited. Embryonic stem cell research has been limited to the lines derived before August 9, 2001, the date of the President's policy announcement.

When the President announced his policy almost 5 years ago, even he acknowledged the tremendous potential of embryonic stem cell research. In fact, that policy allows the research to proceed but only in a very limited way. The resources that we had in 2001 have run out. This research cannot truly move forward without a change in policy. That is why I am disheartened by the President's decision today.

H.R. 810 was crafted according to the ethical guidelines outlined by the President, and it is why I will vote to override his veto today.

It authorizes research only on excess embryos originally created for in vitro fertilization but which are slated for destruction.

It requires informed, voluntary consent of the donor.

The only change to existing policy would be the lifting of the cutoff date of August 9. This is, in fact, not a debate about the ethics of stem cell research, or a debate about when life begins. It is a debate about a date.

H.R. 810 offers our nation's scientists the tools they need to proceed down this historic path. Stem cell research represents the most noble activity in which our government can engage: the protection, promotion, and, indeed, affirmation of the lives of our most vulnerable citizens.

With millions of American patients and their families in mind, I will proudly cast my vote today to override the President's veto. I urge all my colleagues to join me in support of the override.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE).

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a mother, as a Member of this body, and certainly as a concerned citizen who fears that the untapped potential of stem cell research may be falling by the wayside.

I was disheartened to learn that the President did veto H.R. 810 today be-

cause it passed the House by a very significant majority. It is because of my strong respect for and commitment to life that I supported this bill last year.

A sad fact of life is that many of our loved ones suffer from debilitating diseases such as Alzheimer's, diabetes and Parkinson's. But embryonic stem cell research holds promise to cure these illnesses. A visit to the Miami Project, where they are trying to find a cure for paralysis, certainly would convince anyone of the need for this research. They have shown very promising progress.

The bill brings forth hope from embryos that would otherwise be discarded, thrown in the trash. These are embryos that can be used for good and for substantial medical research.

Overriding the veto today will provide promise of hope and promise to millions of Americans suffering from diseases and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of life by voting "yes" to override the President's veto.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) for a unanimous consent request.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman.

I rise strongly to support stem cell research and ask this House to vote "yes" to override the President's veto. I intend to vote "yes" to override the veto.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 810, the "Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act of 2005." We have an opportunity, and a responsibility, to save lives by supporting this bill, and to help Americans who are suffering.

In order to accelerate scientific progress toward the cures and treatments for a wide variety of diseases and debilitating health conditions, such as Parkinson's Disease, Diabetes, Alzheimer's Disease, Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis (ALS), cancer, and spinal cord injuries, it is necessary to expand the number of stem cell lines that can be used in federally funded research.

Our debate today is a historical achievement for two reasons. First, President Bush vetoed this bill, after it passed in both the House of Representatives (238-194) and the Senate (63-37). This was the first time in five and one-half years in office that President Bush has vetoed a bill. This speaks volumes about the failure of our system of checks and balances, the short-sightedness of our executive branch, and the lack of Congressional leadership.

Second, we must reassess and reaffirm the need and commitment of this nation to pursue medical research leadership and scientific innovation. We must do everything in our power to reduce human suffering and better understand human physiology. Today, we must make history. We must override this veto and pass H.R. 810 in order to preserve the ability of our scientists to pursue innovative research with stem cell lines and find effective treatments and cures for the diseases and conditions that plague humankind.

The miracles capable with stem cell research are mind boggling. It may be possible for neurons developed from embryonic stem cells to restore function to paralyzed individuals; breast cancer may be mitigated by embryonic stem cells that mimic and then slow the growth of cancer cells; an embryonic stem cell-aided kidney transplant can help a patient accept a donor organ with minimal dose of drugs; embryonic stem cells can transform and regenerate damaged liver tissue, offering renewed hope to the 1 out of 5 patients who die before they receive a liver transplant.

As a Member of the Science committee, I am dedicated to the advancement of science, to the exploration of creative initiatives, and the pursuit of sound research. When we demonize science, we only hurt ourselves, making it more likely that other countries will stand at the forefront of science and innovation.

According to the National Institutes of Health (NIH), of more than 60 stem cell lines that were declared eligible for federal funding in 2001, only about 22 lines are actually available for study by and distribution to researchers. These NIH-approved lines lack the genetic diversity that researchers need in order to develop effective treatments for millions of Americans.

The policy debate that we have engaged in over the last year has focused on both scientific and moral arguments. This bill is precisely the measured, balanced, rational, and progressive law that we need to further the scope of medicine, while simultaneously defining precise moral guidelines.

At issue in particular is the use of embryonic stem cells, or pluripotent stem cells, versus adult stem cells. The difference is crucial in understanding the immense potential benefit.

Pluripotent stem cells are the most adaptable and unique of all of the stem cell varieties. As opposed to adult stem cells, which are limited to a genre, such as blood cells or bone cells, pluripotent stem cells can eventually specialize in any bodily tissue. Embryonic stem cells are clusters of cells, and cannot develop into a fetus or a human being. The possibilities are literally limitless, and only restricted by time and by funding.

The pluripotent stem cells were derived using non-Federal funds from early-stage embryos donated voluntarily by couples undergoing fertility treatment in an in vitro fertilization (IVF) clinic or from non-living fetuses obtained from terminated first trimester pregnancies. Informed consent was obtained from the donors in both cases. Women voluntarily donating fetal tissue for research did so only after making the decision to terminate the pregnancy.

It is estimated that more than 400,000 excess frozen embryos exist in the United States today and that tens of thousands, and perhaps as many as 100,000, are discarded every year.

When President Bush declared in 2001 that federal funding to stem cell research would be limited, an unprecedented 80 Nobel laureates opposed with this action. They included such notables as James Watson, who co-discovered the DNA double helix, and renowned economist Milton Friedman. In their letter to Mr. Bush, the laureates noted that the embryos to be used in the research were destined for destruction anyway. They wrote, "Under these circumstances, it would be tragic to waste this opportunity to pursue the work

that could potentially alleviate human suffering.”

I ask unanimous consent to submit a copy of this letter to the RECORD.

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

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

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS), another fine leader in this movement.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Colorado for yielding and for her leadership and, in fact, the bipartisan leadership that has brought us to this point today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill to override the President's veto of H.R. 810.

It is really unfortunate that this veto and other opposition of this bill are born out of misinformation about the issue at hand.

Under H.R. 810, the embryos from which stem cells are extracted for research come from in vitro fertilization only.

Each year thousands of embryos, no bigger than the head of a pin, are created in the process of in vitro fertilization, with the support of Congress, by the way.

A small percentage of these embryos are implanted and will, hopefully, grow into children. The rest will be frozen or discarded. They will not be used to create life. They will never become children. They will be lost without purpose.

But H.R. 810 gives them purpose, and this only with the express approval of the donors.

Now, the majority of Members in both the House and Senate affirmed their support for enhancing our use of stem cells in research because they understand that purpose.

Maybe it really isn't surprising that President Bush has vetoed this bill because he doesn't understand, and it is consistent with his signing into law other bills that have cut funding for medical research, denied proper funding for veterans health care, decreased our Nation's ability to confront true health crises.

This administration has ignored and twisted science in a variety of areas, everything from global warming to abstinence-only education.

The refusal to acknowledge the scientific value of embryonic stem cell research is one more tragic misstep. Let's not be the embarrassment of the world yet again. Let's affirm our commitment to saving lives by overriding this veto. Let's untie the hands of sci-

entists on the verge of cures for the world's most devastating diseases.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. SCHMIDT).

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of sustaining the President's veto of H.R. 810. I strongly oppose H.R. 810, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act. An embryo is human life. H.R. 810 would use Federal tax dollars, our tax dollars, to fund the destruction of human life for scientific research. This misguided research is already permitted. What we are debating is who should pay for it. Should it be the taxpayers or private research?

To my colleagues who support this legislation, I share your concern for finding future medical treatments to improve lives. But let's be open in the process and look for ways that do not compromise life in any form, at its beginning, its middle, or end. There is no justification for the destruction of innocent life for the sake of another.

Congress has a moral obligation to protect women and the unborn, and I urge my colleagues to sustain the President's veto and vote "no" on this question.

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

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the President's veto of embryonic stem cell legislation flies in the face of the American people's broad support for this bill. In vetoing this bill, the President has gone against more than 70 percent of Americans who support stem cell research using embryos that would otherwise be discarded.

□ 1730

Even worse, he has thumbed his nose at the millions of Americans suffering from incurable diseases. Americans have kept their hopes alive while this administration has played political games and thrown up roadblocks to the promising research that would offer them a cure.

As opposed to legislation we have passed to encourage research on cord blood and adult stem cells, only this bill, the Castle-DeGette bill, would expand research on the embryonic stem cells that have the unique ability to reproduce indefinitely and evolve into any cell type in our bodies.

I have personally seen the potential that this research holds and how it works. Last summer I visited the stem cell labs at the Baylor College of Medicine in my hometown of Houston, where researchers are looking at treatments for heart disease with just a few Federal lines. The message from the researchers I met with was clear. The current policy not only slows medical progress, but will force the world's

brightest researchers to abandon the U.S. for countries without this restriction on lifesaving research.

My colleagues opposed to this bill have argued this on moral and religious grounds. They are absolutely right. Regardless of whether one practices Christianity, Judaism, or Islam, every religion in the world tells us to alleviate human suffering.

History has shown, however, that even the most devout have often strayed from this common religious and moral duty. According to the New Testament, religious leaders in Biblical times attacked Jesus for healing the sick on the Sabbath. History has apparently repeated itself, as we have religious leaders today casting similar judgments on the healers of our time. Just like the sick in Biblical times, American families suffering from incurable diseases do not have time for the Federal Government to restrict those who could heal them. To alleviate human suffering, that is the purpose of this bill, and that should be our purpose today.

Let us override this veto.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HART).

Ms. HART. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for allowing me some time to speak in favor of sustaining the President's veto.

It has been a year since this House passed the Castle-DeGette bill, and in that year science, not Hollywood, has helped us to debunk the myth of a promise for embryonic stem cell research. Hollywood supports it. Science created fraudulent experiments. Before last year's vote, they made arguments supporting embryonic stem cell research. They were coming fast and furious from our colleagues.

During the debate in the Senate, the same arguments came. They cited Dr. Hwang Wook Suk of South Korea and his research. Supporters of his research said that he had cloned a human embryo, that he had found a way to produce embryonic stem cell lines that could be done routinely and efficiently. What happened later? All of his research was debunked. The ethics of his research were called into question. It was revealed that his publications were faked, his experiments were unsuccessful, and the treatment of their egg donors was ethically grossly appalling.

Mr. Speaker, I urge us to reject embryonic stem cell research as the science is not there. Science is very successful in treating patients using adult stem cells and cord blood stem cells, which we agreed to fund and the President signed, and I believe we should support that.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, of course, the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania refers to the South Korea experiment which was not embryonic stem cell research. Rather, it was somatic cell nuclear transfer, not at issue today. And, furthermore, it only points out why we need Federal oversight and ethics in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, no single action this Congress could take would have a more profound impact on life than increasing Federal funds for biomedical research, biomedical scientists to conduct that research with human embryonic stem cells. Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, brain and spinal cord disorders, diabetes, cancer, at least 58 diseases could potentially be cured through stem cell research, diseases that touch every family in America and in the world.

I stand here as someone who understands the promise of biomedical research all too well. Having been diagnosed with ovarian cancer by chance on a doctor's visit two decades ago, I know firsthand how medical research can save lives. It saved mine. It can quite literally mean the difference between life and death, between hope and despair.

Are there moral issues to consider with respect to stem cell research? Absolutely. But let us not confuse them with the ethical safeguards that this legislation does put in place, allowing research only on embryos that were originally created for fertility treatment purposes and that are in excess of clinical need. By permitting peer-reviewed Federal funds to be used with public oversight, we can have no doubt that this research will be performed with the utmost dignity and ethical responsibility.

The moral issue here is whether the United States Congress is going to stand in the way of science and preclude scientists from doing lifesaving research. We do not live in the Dark Ages. With this vote this Congress has an opportunity to tell the world that we are a country that believes science has the power to advance life. I believe we are. By allowing the President to stop this research from going forward, we risk something very precious.

Mr. Speaker, the world has always looked to America as a beacon of hope precisely because of our capacity to combine the best ideas in the world with abundant resources. Let us continue that tradition. Let us lead the way. Support the veto override.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, this House should override the President's veto of the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act.

With regard to medical research, science should triumph over politics. Stem cell research offers the best promise of ending diabetes, Parkinson's, and cancer. Americans strongly support the treatment of disease, but we are passionate about finding cures.

America has won more Nobel Prizes in medicine than all European countries combined. This legislation is needed to maintain U.S. leadership.

Mr. Speaker, the leading candidates for President in our country of both the Republican and Democratic Parties support this bill. In the House the Republican chairmen of our most powerful committees, Rules, Ways and Means, Appropriations, and Energy, all support this bill. In the Senate the Republican majority leader and the Chairs of Armed Services, Commerce, Appropriations, Foreign Relations, and Rules all supported this bill.

At worst, the President's stem cell policy will last only 30 more months and be reversed on January 20, 2009, regardless of who wins the Presidency.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY).

(Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the effort to override this Presidential veto, of people's right to live a life where they can be free from the illness that they are suffering today, and of my colleague Jim Langevin's right to be able to get out of that wheelchair within his lifetime thanks to stem cell research.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. ENGEL.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Today President Bush has cast the first veto of his Presidency on legislation approved overwhelmingly by the House and Senate: the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act. Frankly, to veto a bill that has the support of 72 percent of the American public is simply unconscionable and indefensible. The President speaks about ethics. I think it is totally unethical not to save lives.

Despite what the critics may say, H.R. 810 does not end life. It honors life. As anyone who suffers from diabetes, Parkinson's disease, ALS, or a whole host of other debilitating health conditions knows, scientists believe embryonic stems cells provide a real opportunity for devising unique treatments for these serious diseases.

Let me be absolutely clear. This is not about cloning. I oppose cloning of human beings. This is about the use of stem cells which would have been discarded anyway. It has been estimated that there are currently 400,000 frozen embryos created during fertility treatments which would be destroyed if they are not donated for research. I would never condone the donation of embryos to science without the informed written consent of donors and strict regulations prohibiting financial compensation for potential donors. Our Nation's scientific research must adhere to the highest critical and ethical standards, and H.R. 810 protects this.

The National Institutes of Health has admitted that U.S. scientists have fall-

en behind Europe and Asia in stem cell research because of President Bush's policy. While five States have committed significant funding, NIH Director Zerhouni has noted that a patchwork collection of different stem cell policies in States could inhibit critical collaborations. We need a national commitment, and the current stem cells that the President alludes to have been contaminated and are no longer useful.

We must not allow those standing in the way of health and science to compromise the future well-being of our families and loved ones. Simply put, that would not be ethical. Over 200 patient groups, universities, and scientific societies have urged the President to expand the Federal policy on stem cell research.

We must honor life by overriding President Bush's veto.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

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

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today proud to stand with our President to ensure that our society remains a people that values life. The President is a man of his word, and today he made good on his promise and he issued his first Presidential veto against H.R. 810, a move to protect the sanctity of human life.

Mr. Speaker, over the last few days, I have had the privilege to meet and visit with the families of the so-called "snowflake babies." These are children who started out life at frozen embryos, indeed no larger than the point of a pen, whose parents, instead of discarding these precious little lives, allowed them to be adopted.

Each of these families has their own unique story. They are families who have longed for and prayed for children. They are families who now enjoy the blessings of these little ones' smiles and tears, laughter and heartbreak. These children represent what advocates of this bill see as unwanted leftovers, collateral damage on society's path to medical research called for in the Castle-DeGette bill.

Mr. Speaker, the interesting aspect of this debate is that embryonic stem cell research does not have to divide this House of Representatives. I am here today to tell the American people that science has delivered the solution to this ethical divide. Scientists have made extraordinary advances in research that now allow them access to embryoniclike stem cells without destroying the human embryo. The answer that science has given us is that our government can have both, and, most importantly, so can the American people.

Yesterday Members of this House, those who claim to be supporters of all types of embryonic stem cell research, stood in the way of a bill that would have funded these ethical and exciting new breakthroughs.

Mr. Speaker, we need to sustain the President's veto, and I call for my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do just that.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished Democratic whip, Mr. HOYER.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

The choices before the Members of this House today are clear and straightforward. Will the Members of the Republican majority choose to stand with George W. Bush, who just minutes ago vetoed this legislation, ironically the very first veto of his Presidency, and, as a result, impede medical research into diseases that afflict millions of Americans? Or will the Members of this Republican majority choose to stand with more than 70 percent of the American people; the most respected members of America's medical research community; and 238 Members of this House and 63 United States Senators, including, of course, majority leader BILL FRIST, all of whom support embryonic stem cell research?

There is little question, Mr. Speaker, about the utility of such research. Scientists, including 80 Nobel Laureates, believe that embryonic stem cell research could lead to treatments and cures for diabetes; Parkinson's; Alzheimer's; multiple sclerosis; cancer; and, as the gentleman from Rhode Island indicated, the rehabilitation of nerves.

Dr. Zerhouni, director of the National Institutes of Health, chosen by George Bush, has stated: "Embryonic stem cell research holds great promise for treating, curing, and improving our understanding and treatment of disease."

□ 1745

The American Medical Association and 92 other organizations stated last week in a letter that "only H.R. 810 will move stem cell research forward."

Senate Majority Leader FRIST, a heart surgeon, has stated, "Embryonic stem cells uniquely hold specific promise that adult stem cells cannot provide."

Nor is there doubt about the need for more stem cell lines, since the lines designated by President Bush in 2001 have proven much less useful than hoped. Dr. Anthony Fauci, director of the National Institute of Allergy And Infectious Diseases, has stated, "Our institute believes that embryonic stem cell research could be advanced by the availability of additional cell lines. We may be limiting our ability to achieve the full range of potential therapeutic application of embryonic stem cells by restricting research to a relatively small number of lines currently available." This legislation seeks to do just what Dr. Fauci says ought to be done.

Mr. Speaker, the Castle-DeGette bill quite simply would authorize Federal funds for research on embryonic stem

cell lines derived from surplus embryos at in vitro fertilization clinics that would otherwise be discarded. That would otherwise be discarded. That seems to me to be critical to every Member's decision.

Equally important, the bill would allow Federal funding of embryonic stem cell research only if strict ethical guidelines are followed. We do not pursue this irresponsibly.

Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most important votes that Members will cast in this Congress, and it will be long remembered by the American people. I implore my colleagues, vote to advance ethical embryonic stem cell research, not impede it. Vote to override the President's misguided veto, which will be looked upon years from now as a momentary victory for ideology over medical research and progress.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT).

(Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I attended the President's news conference with snowflake babies and their families at which the President announced his veto of H.R. 810. Snowflake babies were adopted as excess embryos. Excess embryos would be destroyed with taxpayers' dollars under H.R. 810 to produce pluripotent stem cells for science.

How can anyone look at these snowflake babies and hear their voices and say that it would be okay to kill them to provide materials for medical research?

President Bush transformed what could have been a day of tragedy into a day of triumph by vetoing H.R. 810 and by taking additional steps to support pluripotent stem cell research that does not destroy embryos.

To the proponents of H.R. 810, scientists, doctors and the public, pluripotent stem cells hold the most promise for understanding human diseases and treating devastating conditions. That is why pluripotent stem cells are coveted.

Yesterday, knowing that the President would veto H.R. 810, this body had the opportunity to approve a bill the President said he would sign to use taxpayer dollars to obtain pluripotent stem cells without destroying embryos. This opportunity is not lost to this Congress.

I urge everyone in this Chamber to sustain President Bush's veto and support bringing back for a vote the Bartlett-Santorum bill, S. 2754, which represents common ground into promising ways the Federal Government can support pluripotent stem cell research without sacrificing life for medicine.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman, and especially appreciate the good work that she and Mr. CASTLE have done.

With the President's action today, and he always keeps his word, he condemned tens of millions of Americans and their families and everybody who loves them to suffer needlessly, and all the while they know their government, when given the opportunity to help, decided to do nothing.

I remember this kind of mugwumpery before. I remember when organ transplants came about. Everybody said, oh, no, we can't do that. If God didn't want you to have a good liver, you can't get one from somebody else. The same thing with blood transfusions, all the way through. Why in the world do we always have such a know-nothing, antiscientific government body that tells our scientists what they can do and can't do?

As one of the scientists in this House, I am appalled at the fact that my country is falling behind in scientific research. I am astonished that we are telling scientists what they can and cannot study. It bothers me that scientists in other countries don't want to come here to study anymore because of the way that this has happened.

If we fail to override this veto tonight, we are putting this country back another 200 years. Perhaps not that much. But any of you who believe that voting for that one bill yesterday and wanting to vote for the second will cover you at home, let me tell you that is not true. Science knows better. Science will bear out that we do not have the lines we need for research, and you will pay the price, I hope, in November.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

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

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of overriding the veto.

I urge my colleagues to join in voting to override the Presidential veto of H.R. 810, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act.

I am disappointed the President used his first veto on legislation that has the potential to help millions of Americans affected by debilitating illnesses. I do not believe history will judge his decision kindly.

When the President first allowed this research to go forward in 2001, he could argue that he was setting up reasonable restrictions. I think today it is clear those restrictions are burdensome, ideologically driven and threaten our status as the preeminent country for medical research.

I appreciate that my Leadership has allowed fair debate on this bill and an up-or-down vote, and hope that in the future we will be successful in helping this research to advance.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON).

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of overriding the President's veto of the embryonic stem cell research bill.

Every time I go to a classroom in my district, I tell those kids, knowledge is power, and one of the reasons America is such a great Nation is because knowledge and freedom couple to drive the frontiers of knowledge forward, as they have in science and medicine. And here is another frontier. Yes, we will push forward. The President cannot fence in knowledge, the pursuit of knowledge, in a free society.

But as we push forward, that research will not be covered and guided by the ethical code developed by NIH. As we push forward, millions of dollars will be wasted on building a parallel infrastructure of expensive equipment so the State and Federal dollars and the private and Federal dollars can be kept separate.

It is a tragedy that our President has vetoed this important bill, and I will vote to override.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CARNAHAN).

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this landmark stem cell bill and in opposition to President Bush's unbelievable first-ever veto.

We reached an historic crossroad today in Washington. With the stroke of his pen, the President could have signed stem cell hope and ethical standards into law. But, sadly, the President has delayed medical advances for years.

H.R. 810 will provide the Federal resources necessary to unlock the door to lifesaving cures for millions. It was passed after extraordinary debate and historic bipartisan cooperation. It holds the promise of major advancements in science.

I am deeply disappointed by the President's veto, as are millions of Americans and thousands of my fellow Missourians that have been working, hoping and praying for the approval of this bill. We will not soon forget what happened today. We will not give up. This issue has united Americans into action with a powerful voice.

I strongly urge my colleagues to override the President's veto, to continue the work of embryonic stem cell research and to provide hope for those who need it most.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SCHWARZ).

Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, medical research in the United States has for decades been the envy of the world. That embryonic stem cell research holds the key to potential treatment for all manner of disease is already well documented in this debate.

As a physician, I am dismayed at the claims that adult stem cells and umbilical cord cells hold the true

pluripotentiality of embryonic stem cells. This is simply not true.

I ask my colleagues to vote to override the veto of this bill. Embryonic stem cell research will continue apace in other parts of the world. It is sad that the great progress and potential in this field won't happen in the United States with our superb academic scientific facilities. It is sadder yet that those who oppose this bill don't recognize that embryonic stem cells represent the epitome, the ultimate, in those things prolife, that is, to save the lives of our fellow members of the human race.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, at issue here is the fundamental value of saving lives, a value that we all share regardless of race, culture or religion. Embryonic stem cells have the potential not just to treat some of the most devastating diseases and conditions, but to actually cure them.

The President's veto of this lifesaving legislation is a slap in the face of the millions of Americans suffering from diseases like Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, or debilitating physical injuries, who found new hope for treatment and cures with the passage of H.R. 810. This hope will remain only if researchers have access to the science that holds the most potential and are free to explore, with appropriate ethical guidelines, medical advances never before imagined possible.

The 67 percent of the American public that supports embryonic stem cell research understands this. Why doesn't the President?

There is no question that scientific advancement often comes with moral dilemmas. That is why we have examined and debated difficult ethical and social questions before passing this legislation.

Like many of you, I believe that strong guidelines must be in place with vigorous oversight from the NIH and Congress before allowing federally-funded embryonic stem cell research.

H.R. 810 would strengthen the standards guiding embryonic stem cell research and would ensure that embryos originally created for the purpose of in vitro fertilization could be made available for research only with the consent of the donor.

So today I ask my colleagues to be as determined to find a cure as science allows us to be. We are closer than ever to remarkable discoveries and on the brink of providing hope to millions of individuals who otherwise have none. Congress must not allow the President to once again put ideology before science.

I urge my colleagues to vote to override of the President's veto of the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to override the Presidential veto of H.R. 810. The Sen-

ate's 63-37 vote yesterday to loosen the stranglehold on federally conducted stem cell research and set strict ethical standards for performing that research and the strong showing of support by the House in May of last year marked a triumph of science over politics.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to support the override of this veto.

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT).

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader for yielding me time, and thank you for your continued support on this issue.

I do rise today to voice my support for the President's veto of H.R. 810. With today's vote, the House will place itself alongside the millions of Americans who believe that all life is precious, even at its earliest stages.

This bill, H.R. 810, would make taxpayer dollars available for embryonic stem cell research using embryos remaining from in vitro fertilization procedures.

Mr. Speaker, that is the issue. Taxpayers should not be forced to fund what some consider morally wrong.

It is still questionable whether embryonic stem cell research will even yield results. I believe we should focus our resources on the proven, the successful adult stem cell research that is working to produce real, meaningful results. That we can all agree on.

Proponents of embryonic stem cell research point to their hope of potential lifesaving benefits from such research. I support the goal, but destroying a life to try to save another is not the way to accomplish it.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on this legislation.

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE).

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to join many of my colleagues today in opposing the President's veto of H.R. 810. I do so reluctantly. I think the overriding of a veto of any President should be undertaken with caution, but in this case I believe it is necessary.

When the House considered this bill last year, our debate focused on the ethical dilemmas of embryonic stem cell research. Those dilemmas are real, and they've been thoroughly addressed in the bill we passed.

What hasn't been noted enough, however, is the importance this bill has for American innovation. The President himself has written—quote—"Through America's investments in science and technology, we have revolutionized our economy and changed the world for the better. Groundbreaking ideas generated by innovative minds in the private and public sectors have paid enormous dividends—improving the lives and livelihoods of generations of Americans."

These words are true—and to his credit, the President has backed them up with his American Competitiveness Initiative, a set of proposals that every Member in this House has embraced.

So I ask my colleagues: what field will prove more crucial to American competitiveness, to human well-being, to economic growth, than the biological sciences? And what area of research holds more promise in the biological sciences than stem cells?

Over the past two decades, three-quarters of the researchers who have won the Nobel Prize in medicine have studied or taught in the United States. Can we really expect to retain the global leadership if we can't even pass a bill, a thoughtful, bipartisan bill, that assures the moral study of embryonic stem cells? "Assures." I use the word deliberately, because no other nation will meet, let alone exceed, the ethical guidelines and constraints embodied in Castle-DeGette. Each of us knows that.

The sooner we pass this bill into law, the sooner America becomes the hub for this research, the sooner our ethical standards become the de facto standards governing stem cell science around the world.

So Castle-DeGette isn't just about taking the scientific lead on embryonic stem cells, it is about taking the moral lead, setting an ethical standard for research that will take place whether this bill becomes law or not. I urge my colleagues to override this veto.

□ 1800

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS).

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, last May I voted in support of H.R. 810. I rise again today to override the veto of this legislation.

I want to take this opportunity to reiterate why I believe that expanded Federal funding of stem cell research is good public policy. We are aware of the potential embryonic stem cells hold. They could hold the key to the greatest mysteries of medical science, offering cures for those afflicted with Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, juvenile diabetes, spinal cord injuries and others. I hope they do.

On the other hand, they can be nothing but a source of false hope, another disappointment for those who wish for a return to health either for themselves or their loved ones. The only certainty is that we will never know the answer if our scientists are overly constrained in their efforts. Without the wherewithal of the National Institutes of Health, we face the prospect of numerous State agencies attempting to set up research protocols, something they are not well equipped to do.

Good science takes time. We must not throw caution to the wind at the hint of miraculous cures. Indeed, left unconstrained, this type of research could lead to dangerous outcomes.

H.R. 810 provides ethical guidelines by which federally funded researchers must comply. I believe it would be far

preferable to have the Federal Government setting standards in this field rather than a hodgepodge of States and private entities. The Federal Government should lead the way.

I supported President Bush when he announced his plan to allow federally funded research on 60 preexisting lines. Now, though, we only have 22 lines with significant shortcomings that make them of dubious value.

Federally funded U.S. researchers are at a technical disadvantage as they lack access to newer stem cell lines. Our top stem cell biologists are moving into non-federally funded research or even going overseas to pursue their work. We should not allow this to happen.

There is no question that many difficult questions attend this debate, and many feel strongly that there are ethical reasons not to pursue embryonic stem cell research. But I strongly feel there are ethical reasons why we should. I cannot look at a couple whose child is suffering from a debilitating disease in the eye and tell them I am not doing everything as their elected official; I came to find a cure. I cannot look at a researcher in the eyes and tell him I will not let him explore the promise.

I urge my colleagues to vote to override this veto.

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader for yielding. In her opening remarks, the chief Democratic sponsor of this bill told us that embryonic stem cell research will cure Alzheimer's. This is yet another example of the misinformation the bill's proponents have been spreading for the past year.

Let me read from a Washington Post article by Rick Weiss: "Given the lack of any serious suggestion that stem cells themselves have practical potential to treat Alzheimer's, the Reagan-inspired tidal wave of enthusiasm stands as an example of how easily a modest line of scientific inquiry can grow in the public mind to mythological proportions. It is a distortion that some admit is not being aggressively corrected by scientists."

Said Ronald D.G. McKay, stem cell researcher at the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke, "Embryonic stem cell research may never cure any disease."

However, ethical adult stem cell research has already resulted in nine FDA-approved therapies for major diseases. We should support ethical research that works.

In this binder I have information from established medical journals for over 70, 72 to be exact, successful treatments that have been discovered using ethical research of adult stem cells; not a single embryo has been destroyed in the process.

In this binder I have the successful treatments derived from embryo-destroying stem cell research. Not a single cure. The score is 72-0. All it has to show for itself are failed experiments, disgraced researchers, tumors and dead laboratory rats.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the President for doing the right thing and vetoing this unethical and unnecessary legislation. I urge all of my colleagues to sustain the President's veto. Reject H.R. 810.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, President Bush made history today by adding a major black mark to a Presidency that began on the comforting note of compassionate conservatism, but is ending with a jarring jab to the sick and the ill.

There have been 1,484 previous formal vetoes of legislation enacted by Congress in the history of this country, but this one may be the most damaging veto ever issued by any President. If the Congress does not override this veto of this bipartisan stem cell research act, this will be remembered as a Luddite moment in American history, when scientific progress was brought to a halt by those who put fear ahead of hope, and ideology ahead of science.

Research is medicine's field of dreams from which we harvest cures, cures which offer hope to millions of American families struggling with Parkinson's, Alzheimer's, heart disease, juvenile diabetes and cancer. Hope is the most powerful four-letter word in the English language. But if we allow this Bush veto to stand, we will snuff out this flickering candle of hope just as the candle was lit.

Vote for the override of this historic veto of scientific progress. Vote to give the American people a reason to believe.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN).

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I have heard it said that the President's veto is a political game. There are no political games being played here, except yesterday when the authors of this bill that is before us argued that people should vote against H.R. 5526, the Alternative Pluripotent Stem Cell Therapies Enhancement Act. Why would they do that? A bill that would allow a neutral, that is neutral with respect to ethics, opportunity to develop pluripotent stem cell therapies. And yet we are told here that we are allowing ideology to get in the way of science.

What was yesterday's request by those who authored this bill? You know, we have to consider ethics. Science cannot tell us what to do. It tells us what we can do, but it does not tell us what it is ethically appropriate to do.

This country leads the world in medical research, but it also leads the world in ethical action. We should not be losers in either side. Support the President's veto.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER).

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, like millions of Americans, I, too, am disappointed with the President's veto. In Kansas City, Missouri, a man by the name of Jim and his wife Virginia Stowers started a company called American Centuries. It became one of the most successful companies in this country. A few years ago they decided that they would give back. Both of them are cancer survivors, and so they founded the Stowers Institute. It is an institution in Kansas City, Missouri, designed and funded by this great couple to research all kinds of medical cures. I will tell them later today that no Federal funds can be used.

Behind all of the opposition to stem cell research, there seems to be a subliminal religious tone. I am a fundamentalist in that I believe that the Holy Bible is the inspired and interminable word of God. But I am baffled by my fellow fundamentalists who seem to be utterly opposed to and terror-stricken by the advancement of science, including stem cell research.

The propagation of knowledge by some in our faith seems to be a foreboding foray toward undermining or diminishing the glory of the Creator. However, the opposite is true. When the human intellect makes strides that sets the world agog, it is God from whom all knowledge stems who is honored.

And keep in mind that scientific advancement is not an enemy of faith, but rather a bold statement that God is still active in this universe.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude by just saying that it is a great testament to God if we are able to advance science. It means that His power is supreme.

Because I accept the Bible as the inspired and interminable Word of God, I consider myself to be a Christian fundamentalist. I accept, as an inseparable component of my faith, the omnipotence, omnipresence, and omniscience of God. Therefore, I am baffled by my fellow fundamentalists who seem to be utterly opposed to and terror-stricken by the advancement of science, including stem cell research. The propagation of knowledge and the dismantling of the boundless awe-inspiring mysteries of God's world are viewed by some in our faith as a foreboding foray toward undermining and diminishing the glory of the Creator. However, the opposite is true. When the human intellect makes strides that sets the world agog, it is God, from whom all knowledge stems, who is honored. Let us keep in mind that scientific advancement is not an enemy of faith, but rather a bold statement of Praise.

Contemporary men and women of faith, as always, stand at the crossroads. In a real sense, religion has always been impelled to wage war in some area or another. The pressing question is shall we march across the bat-

tlefields of faith with open arms toward the magnificent revelations of God's great truths, or, do we use our inherent power and influence to signal a retreat from the bright and simmering sunshine of expanding scientific scholarship. The potential life-saving issue of stem cell research is before us. The scepter is in the hands of the enlightened community of believers. Our failure to speak out on the medical need for stem cell research will allow earnest but erroneous or misguided souls who wish to constrain such study to force us back to a time when the faithful waged its fiery finger of scorn at the irreverence of scientific inquiry. Like the majority of people of faith, I totally reject the notion that today's community of believers are as troglodytic as our ancestors who refused to peer through the lens of Galileo's telescope. Nonetheless, this is a testing time.

Doctor Harry Emerson Fosdick, the legendary Baptist clergyman of the first half of the 20th century, profoundly addresses the issue of flowering faith in his wonderfully inspiring book, *The Modern Use of the Bible*: "If there are fresh things to learn concerning the physical universe, let us have them, that we may find deeper meaning when we say, 'The heavens declare the glory of God.'"

If there is a great possibility to uncover new cures for the beastly diseases which besiege the human body, the community of faith must implore the researchers to explore, seize, and use them. After all, the One we claim as the Imminent Source and Guide of the Universe is befitting of our very best.

Sure, the scientific research on stem cells must be moral. The institutions of scientific research must understand that there are moral mandates that cannot be infringed or ignored with impunity. When the sway of the intellect becomes extreme, the religious must repudiate and guide it back to equilibrium and reason. Additionally, when the community of faith clings to the debilitating conventionalism of a petrified past, some among us must push against that as well.

Should science succeed in fulfilling the much vaunted optimism expressed by advocates of stem cell therapy, much of the credit should go to the community of faith. Every experiment that leads to greater medical breakthroughs is a discernible display of the earthly presence of God and of the presence of particles of his divinity in us.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader for yielding me time, and for his leadership today and every day.

Mr. Speaker, never in my 26 years as a Member of Congress have I seen so much hyperbole, misinformation and misattribution of success as in the embryonic stem cell debate.

Despite recent revelations of massive fraud by prominent stem cell researchers in South Korea, despite the fact that there hasn't been anything even close to success of any kind in treating any human being anywhere in the world with embryonic stem cells, despite all of this and so much more, embryonic stem cell proponents demand that tens of thousands of perfectly healthy human embryos be destroyed for taxpayer-funded research.

This is especially troubling in light of the stunning breakthroughs and successes announced almost daily of adult and cord blood stem cell therapies that are today helping men and women with leukemia, sickle cell anemia, and a myriad of other diseases. Ethical stem cell research, Mr. Speaker, has given not only hope, but it has given us real, durable therapies that work.

Arguments were made on this floor, Mr. Speaker, that we are just using spare or leftover embryos as if they exist as a subclass of surplus human beings that can be experimented on or slaughtered at will.

A few hours ago at the White House, several of us met with some of those snowflake children, all of whom were adopted while they were still in their embryonic stage and frozen in what we like to call frozen orphanages. Believe me, watching snowflakes children laugh, smile and act, well, like kids underscored the fact that they are every bit as human and alive and precious as any other child. Under the Castle bill, these so-called surplus humans are throwaways. Adopt them, don't destroy them.

Mr. Speaker, finally, make no mistake about it, those of us who oppose the Castle bill support aggressive stem cell research and judicious application of stem cells to mitigate and cure diseases. That is why I sponsored the Stem Cell Therapeutic and Research Act of 2005. It provides \$265 million for comprehensive cord blood and bone marrow stem cells. That is why we support the \$609 million in FY 2006 currently been expended under the NIH for ethical stem cells.

Yesterday, Hannah Stregge, the first known snowflake embryo adoption, told a small group of us: "Don't kill the embryos, we are kids and we want to grow up too." How come a 7-year-old gets it and we don't. Sustain the veto.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Democratic leader (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time. I salute her for her outstanding leadership and stewardship of this bill and her leadership on this issue so important to America's families. I also commend Congressman CASTLE of Delaware for his courage and his leadership as well.

Mr. Speaker, every family in America, indeed every person in this room and in this gallery, is just one diagnosis or one phone call away from needing the benefits of the embryonic stem cell research. Today with his veto, President Bush dashed the hopes of so many Americans who were praying for this legislation and the cures that it can bring. Imagine, the first veto of this President, and it is for a bill vetoing a bill that has the miraculous power to cure.

The Latin root of veto, the Latin translation of veto means "I forbid." President Bush has said today, I forbid allowing the best and brightest minds

to pursue the science that they believe has the most promise and potential to cure.

□ 1815

President Bush says, I forbid bringing embryonic stem cell research under NIH, ensuring the strict controls and stringent ethical guidelines that only NIH can ensure and impose. President Bush says, I forbid giving our scientists the opportunities they need to ensure that our Nation remains preeminent in science.

Today, I am hoping that the people's House will reflect the American people's will and overturn this short-sighted action, and instead of saying "I forbid," say "yes" to the American people.

The opponents of this legislation believe that this is a struggle between faith and science. I believe that faith and science have at least one thing in common: Both are searches for truth. America has room for both faith and science, and thank God for that.

The Episcopal Church, in its letter in support of this legislation says, "As stewards of creation, we are called to help mend and renew the world in many ways. The Episcopal Church celebrates medical research, and this research expands our knowledge of God's creation and empowers us to bring potential healing to those who suffer from disease and disability." It is our duty here in Congress to bring hope to the sick and the disabled, not to bind the hands of those who can bring them hope.

I believe, as Representative EMANUEL CLEAVER has said, I believe that God guided our researchers to discover the stem cell's power to heal. Overturning the President's cruel veto will enable science to live up to its potential to answer the prayers of America's families.

According to many scientists, including 80 Nobel Laureates, embryonic stem cell research has the potential to unlock the doors to treatments and cures to numerous diseases, and we have spoken about them all day, including diabetes, Parkinson's disease, Alzheimer's, Lou Gehrig's disease, multiple sclerosis, cancer and spinal cord injuries, to name a few.

Many of our colleagues both here on the floor and other venues, have shared their personal stories, whether it is a condition of their children or an affliction of their parents. Their generosity of spirit and generosity to share those stories gives us testimony as to the need for this embryonic stem cell research, and it fills a void in science that we know can be filled. I believe that if we know a scientific opportunity to cure, we have a moral responsibility to support it.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will save lives and help us find the cures for diseases in a shorter time span. It is all about time, after all, how much time people have, the quality of their lives in that time frame.

This bill will enable science to live up to the biblical power to cure. I urge

all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on the override and override the President's cruel veto.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Florida. I thank the majority leader for yielding time. I rise in support of the President's veto. I applaud President Bush's courage in doing this, and I encourage all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to sustain this veto.

This is not about whether we are going to fund more embryonic stem cell research. We are funding embryonic stem cell research. We funded \$38 million of human embryonic stem cell research last year. This is not about whether it is legal or not. It is legal in the United States to do embryonic stem cell research. Indeed, this is really not about whether the United States is going to fall behind in this area of research.

The United States leads the world because of the President's program, publishing 46% of the published research articles on human embryonic stem cell research.

So what is this about, what are we debating today? We lead the world. We are funding it. What are we debating?

What we are debating today in this Chamber is whether or not we are going to use taxpayer dollars to kill more human embryos. That is really what this debate is all about. This business about cures being around the corner, jeeppers, I have said this, and nobody has refuted it, they don't have an animal model that shows that embryonic stem cells work and they are safe.

Nobody has gotten an FDA approval to use human embryonic stem cells in a human trial. But we have each year 10, 15 or more clinical trials published in the literature showing adult stem cells and core blood stem cells work.

This is a debate about whether or not we are going to have the imprimatur of the United States Government to say that certain forms of human life can be discarded.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 3 minutes.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, this is a sad day for America. But what is so sad is that our opponents would so distort the facts to stop research that would benefit so many. Many have talked today about the so-called snowflake babies, embryos which are donated to other couples. I don't oppose that. I think that is great.

But right now couples undergoing IVF treatment have three options for the spare embryos that are necessarily created. They can freeze them for future use by themselves. They can donate them to other couples, as several hundred have done, or they can say that the embryos that are left over should be destroyed as medical waste, and tens of thousands of those embryos have been destroyed.

All we say today, give those couples a fourth choice. Let those embryos that would be thrown away as medical waste be donated for ethical embryonic stem cell research. The opponents of this bill also continue to claim that adult stem cell and core blood cells are just as good as embryonic stem cells. Shame on them. This is a bald lie.

Harold Varmus, the former director of the NIH, said just this week, compared to adult stem cells, embryonic stem cells have a much greater potential according to all existing scientific literature. Let's not distort the facts just for a political argument.

This Congress has been politicizing science in a way that the American public disagrees with. Earlier this year, we tried to assert our jurisdiction over end-of-life decisions with the terrible vote that we took in the Terry Schiavo case. Now, today, we are trying to stop ethical scientific research that could help tens of millions of people.

Many on the other side say, well, the taxpayers shouldn't fund this research. Excuse me, I thought we had a national consensus, 72 percent of Americans agree with this precept, people who are Democrats, Republicans, independents, prolife, prochoice. I don't know who decided that they were God and that Congress could not fund this research, because their religious thinking trumps the national consensus.

A majority of my constituents don't think we should fund the war. Does that mean we shouldn't fund the war? Of course not.

We need this ethical research. We need it for our colleague, JIM LANGEVIN, so he can walk again. We need it for our colleague, LANE EVANS, whose Parkinson's has made him so sick that he cannot be here today to vote to override this bill.

Let's give hope to millions of Americans. Let's give hope for ethical research. Let us override this veto.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) for a unanimous-consent request.

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

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of sustaining the President's veto. This is not a vote for or against stem cell research. Many U.S. companies and universities are engaged in a great deal of embryonic stem cell research.

In fact, the President and the U.S. Congress have supported this research with over \$90 million for embryonic stem cell lines derived from embryos that had already been destroyed with more than 700 shipments to researchers since 2001.

The question is whether to use federal money or U.S. taxpayer dollars to destroy human embryos for research?

The research bears out that several types of stem cell research have been successful. These are adult stem cells and umbilical cord blood stem cells.

However, no research has shown embryonic stem cell research to be fruitful. A year ago

when we debated this issue, a study at Seoul National University in Korea was brought up as an example of success to create the world's first embryonic stem cells from a cloned human embryo. Since then, we've learned that study was filled with erroneous data. The DNA studies on the two preserved stem cells did not match those from the published study and were not cloned human embryonic stem cells.

But, beyond this, we must keep in mind how we use human life and think about where we should draw the line.

Those who support destroying embryos for this research have stated these will be embryos that will be discarded. This is not true.

Many parents would love to adopt these embryos and raise these children as their own. According to the non-partisan RAND Corporation the "vast majority" or 88 percent of the 400,000 embryos that have been frozen since the late 1970s are not going to be discarded but are held for family building and not for medical research. In fact, over 21 families who visited the White House last year adopted these embryos in order to fulfill their own dreams of having a family.

Even to refer to these embryos as ones that are unwanted and will be destroyed raises the ultimate question: where do we and where will we draw the line?

If we say a human embryo is unwanted and discardable, we head down the road of asking "what next?"

Do we view seriously disabled newborns as unwanted? Will it be acceptable to discard them?

This is a road down which we cannot afford to turn.

The research does not support it, morality does not condone it. U.S. taxpayer dollars must not support destroying a life to save a life.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON), the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, for a unanimous-consent request.

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

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as a 22-year Congressman with a 100 percent prolife voting record, minus two votes, I rise in opposition to the Presidential veto and support the effort to override it.

Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in support of H.R. 810 and overriding the President's earlier veto of this legislation. H.R. 810 would expand the number of sources of embryonic stem cell lines that may be used in federally funded scientific research. The bill would allow the limited use of human embryonic stem cells that are derived from embryos that would otherwise be discarded from fertility clinics.

This is not an issue where everyone agrees. There are deeply held views on both sides of the difficult question before us, and I want to emphasize that every one of my colleagues should vote in accordance with their own conscience. I support the bill, and I want to say why.

Stem cells are cells that can differentiate into many different kinds of cells used in the body. They can come from several sources, such as adult stem cells, but many scientists believe that the most potential for productive

research lies in embryonic stem cells, which could have the capacity to differentiate into any cell in the body. If researchers can find such a perfect stem cell that can differentiate into any other cell type, we may be able to unlock the cures to hundreds of diseases that afflict us today.

This is more than a sterile, academic matter to me. Diseases like Parkinson's, diabetes, cancer, heart disease, have stricken millions of Americans and continue to take a heavy toll on all of us. I can tell you that it is a living nightmare to watch a loved one suffer from a terrible illness and know that there is nothing that you can do but be by their side. That was the experience I had when my father died of complications of diabetes at the age of 71. It was also the experience I had when my younger brother, Jon Kevin Barton, died of liver cancer at the age of 44.

When my brother was diagnosed, we tried everything. They found his liver cancer when he was just 41 years old. He and his wife, Jennifer, had two children, Jack and Jace. He was a state district judge in Texas. After they told Jon he had liver cancer, we did everything we could, and, in fact, his cancer went into remission for a year. But it came back, and Jon died just three months short of his 44th birthday. That was 6 years ago. Every time I see Jace and Jack and their Mom, I think of Jon and wonder if stem cell research could have allowed him to be alive today.

I do not know for sure, but my heart tells me that stem cell research might have led to treatments that could have helped my brother and my father. We cannot be certain, but maybe the answers for finding cures for many of the diseases that afflict us lie in stem cell research. Many scientists believe that once we can identify a perfect, undifferentiated stem cell line, it will lead to significant scientific breakthroughs and the discovery of cures for many diseases.

It is the hope of a cure for people suffering today and their families that led me to decide to support this legislation. I believe hope is what led President Bush to take the steps he did in August, 2001, when he permitted for the first time Federal taxpayer dollars to be spent on embryonic stem cell research. He recognized the profound benefits that were possible through embryonic research, and he wanted to let the research go forward in a way that respected life and the moral and ethical views of millions of Americans. The President's decision struck a delicate balance between respecting the life of human embryos and giving hope to the American families who are enduring the suffering and loss of debilitating diseases like diabetes and cancer.

But when the President made his announcement in 2001, it was believed that there were at least 60 viable lines of stem cells that could be used for this research. For a variety of reasons, this has turned out not to be the case; not all of these potential lines are now available for research. Currently, there are approximately 22 lines of embryonic stem cells that are available for federally funded research. None of those lines that are currently allowed for Federal research purposes have been shown to have that breakthrough stem cell—the one cell that can differentiate into all 220 cell types in the body.

The President's initial decision reflects the difficulty of this issue. However, when new facts arise on the one hand that tell us the

embryonic stem cell lines already used for federal research do not hold the promise we once thought, it should require us to reevaluate that initial decision in light of the facts.

I continue to support the expansion of cord blood and bone marrow stem cell research, and perhaps the breakthrough we are all hoping for will come from adult stem cells. But at this point, we cannot know for sure where the breakthrough will come from, and it is my belief that we need to keep all of our options open while continuing to go forward in a moral and ethical way.

I fully understand that there are people of good conscience that will disagree with me. I completely respect their views and differences of opinion. Like many on the other side of this legislation, I am also strongly pro-life. For over two decades in the United States Congress, I have had a strong pro-life voting record. I remain pro-life, but for the reasons I have given, I intend to vote in favor of this legislation.

As my colleagues continue to debate the merits of this bill, I only ask that we try to respect one another's various points of view and that no one is ridiculed for their beliefs on either side of this complex and difficult issue.

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

My colleagues, we have had a very good debate. This is an issue that has been very divisive in this House for the last year or so, and the President has made his position very clear.

But let me make the position very clear that embryonic research with regard to stem cells is occurring and is going to continue to occur. The issue here is whether Federal funds, taxpayer dollars ought to be used to destroy human life in the search for cures for other diseases. That is what the issue is, pure and simple. We all know that this research is going to continue in the private sector with private monies.

But the debate that we have had is whether it is appropriate to take taxpayer funds to destroy human life to find embryonic stem cells. I believe that my colleagues, enough of my colleagues will stand up today to sustain the President's veto.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues, to vote "no" on overriding the President's veto.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, it is a momentous event when a president vetoes a bill. It is a pronouncement that the lawmaking body of our federal government is in error and that the difficult lawmaking process has produced legislation not worthy of enactment. For the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act of 2005, nothing could be further from the truth. I was proud to have voted for H.R. 810 when it first came to the House Floor for a vote in May 2005, and I am proud today to vote to override the President's veto—the first veto of his Administration.

A broad spectrum of lawmakers from both parties and all regions of the country recognize the extraordinary opportunity that stem cell research presents to treat and cure tragic diseases afflicting millions of Americans. Some of these potential treatments were only dreamt about a generation ago. Alzheimer's, paralysis, Parkinson's, diabetes—the list of possible applications for stem cell research

goes on and on. For some of the victims of these diseases, stem cell research provides the only present hope for a cure. To use the President's first and only veto to effectively deny these citizens of their best hope is as tragic as it is wrongheaded. H.R. 810 carefully ensures that this research is conducted in a manner consistent with the highest ethical standards.

There have been numerous times in history when a chief executive has denied the progress of science. We mark these times as setbacks for humanity, and we also recognize that in many cases, progress was only delayed, not curtailed. Despite the setback of this veto, the struggle will continue—both the struggle for Americans seeking to overcome disability and disease, and the struggle to support the scientific community in its quest to find the effective cures and treatments. I am confident that the American people will not allow this veto to forever impede the progress of science.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 810, the "Stem Cell Research and Enhancement Act", and urge my colleagues to reject President Bush's regrettable veto.

We are here to decide once again whether our Nation will move forward in the search for treatments and therapies that will cure a multitude of dreaded diseases that afflict an estimated 128 million Americans. These diseases include Alzheimer's disease, Parkinson's disease, spinal cord injuries or spinal dysfunction, and diabetes. Embryonic stem cell research holds the potential for treating these diseases, and many more.

H.R. 810 is a sensible and targeted path forward. It would impose strict ethical guidelines for embryonic stem cell research and would lift the arbitrary restriction limiting funds to only some embryonic stem cell lines created before August 10, 2001. By removing this arbitrary restriction, H.R. 810 will ensure that researchers can not only continue their work to prolong or save lives, but also conduct such research using newer, less contaminated, more diverse, and more numerous embryonic stem cells.

H.R. 810 does not allow Federal funding for the creation or destruction of embryos. This bill only allows for research on embryonic stem cell lines retrieved from embryos created for reproductive purposes that would otherwise be discarded. This point is critical: if these embryos are not used for stem cell research, they will be destroyed.

President Bush's rejection of this narrow and commonsense measure should be overridden by the people's House.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, every American has a very personal stake in today's discussion on stem cell research. Everyone knows people who would benefit from breakthrough research using stem cells. Indeed, with a hundred million Americans at risk from a variety of diseases ranging from Lou Gehrig's disease, to Alzheimer's, to Parkinson's, to cancer, to juvenile diabetes, it's almost impossible to not know somebody who could potentially be helped by stem cell research. For me, the most important beneficiaries are our children and grandchildren who have not yet shown any symptoms, but who may fall victim to one of these devastating diseases.

H.R. 810 is an opportunity for Congress to clarify the issues and exert leadership in a

way that the federal government has in the past. Instead the President vetoed the bill after having passed through the House and Senate. This administration is out of touch with the 70% of the American public who supports stem cell research. We have inadequate access to stem cell lines for research purposes and we are putting forth neither money nor encouragement while we construct artificial boundaries. These misguided policies by the administration will not stop progress from stem cell research, but will delay the day we have these very important therapies to transform people's lives. Americans are losing ground on this vital research to other countries while relinquishing leadership to the states here in our country.

Stem cell research is not about cloning a human being or creating embryos for research purposes. We can maintain prohibitions against cloning of humans while supplying stem cells in an ethical manner from 400,000 embryos already accessible that will otherwise be destroyed.

Every American needs to watch this closely. The stakes in this debate are high both for the potential benefit to the physical condition of all humankind, as well as the establishment of the boundaries between public policy and personal theology.

For me the choice is clear. American families deserve an opportunity for embryonic stem cell research to be conducted in a reasonable, controlled manner, to hasten the day of vital life-saving, life-enriching therapy.

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Speaker, I am outraged that President Bush has single handedly stifled the advancement of medical research that could provide cures for millions of Americans who are suffering needlessly from a wide range of debilitating diseases. President Bush's decision to use his veto power for the first time in his Presidency on this historic piece of legislation is unconscionable and a misguided attempt to pander to the extreme base in his party. The tireless efforts made by the scientific community, stem cell advocates and supportive Members of Congress finally came to fruition when this body passed the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act (H.R. 810). This legislation, supported by a majority of Americans, expands the embryonic stem cell lines available for conducting research and allows the federal government to fund this type of undertaking.

Stem cell research (including embryonic stem cell research) offers incredible hope to the sufferers of diseases like Parkinson's, Alzheimer's, multiple sclerosis, cancer and diabetes. Embryonic stem cells are derived from donated embryos that are not used during the process of in-vitro fertilization and would otherwise be discarded. Many scientists believe that embryonic stem cells have greater potential than adult stem cells because they can differentiate into any specialized cell in the body. Additionally, they can be administered to patients without fear of rejection or the need for expensive immunosuppressive drugs.

Unfortunately, in one fell swoop, President Bush has preemptively thwarted medical progress, destroying the hope of millions of Americans desperately waiting for a cure. Medical science is at a crossroads with incredible potential to save and improve the lives of chronic and fatal disease sufferers. At this time, our government should be doing everything possible to advance and explore all ave-

nues of medical research. With polls showing 60 percent of the country supporting embryonic stem cell research, it is indefensible that President Bush chose to ignore the will of the American people by striking down this monumental measure.

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the veto override of H.R. 810, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act. This bipartisan legislation would expand Federal funding for embryonic stem cell research.

The House approved this bill last year and it won U.S. Senate approval yesterday. However, despite the measure passing both chambers of Congress, the President has vetoed the legislation, the first of his presidency. I am disappointed the President chose this bill to be his first veto.

The American Medical Association and 92 other organizations, including scientists and researchers support H.R. 810. Federal funding would enable further research to examine many new lines of stem cells—increasing the potential for cures. Each year 8,000 to 10,000 embryos created for in-vitro fertilization are destroyed. H.R. 810 would allow Federally funded research of stem cells, which scientists believe can yield cures for diseases and injuries, to be harvested from surplus frozen embryos that are stored at fertility clinics and slated for destruction.

Human embryonic stem cells are prized because they can replicate themselves and become almost any type of human tissue. We all know someone who can benefit from the research. Science should prevail over politics.

President Bush's veto is standing in the way of hope and progress in curing many diseases such as diabetes, Parkinson's disease, Alzheimer's disease, Lou Gehrig's disease, some cancers, and spinal cord injuries. This veto has ignored our country's healthcare needs and has slowed the potential to eradicate life threatening and chronic diseases.

The President did not make the right choice. This critical life saving bill is greatly needed. I urge my colleagues to support the veto override and reaffirm Congress's support of life saving medical research.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, President Bush unfortunately vetoed funding for life-saving research on stem cells from donated, surplus embryos because he maintains it's wrong to "promote science which destroys life in order to save life."

As the leading pro-life legislator in Washington, Sen. ORRIN HATCH put it, "Since when does human life begin in a petri dish in a refrigerator?"

To reduce this issue to an abortion issue is a horrible injustice to 100 million Americans suffering the ravages of diabetes, spinal cord paralysis, heart disease, Parkinson's and Alzheimer's disease, cancer, multiple sclerosis, Lou Gehrig's disease and other fatal, debilitating diseases.

I've met with medical researchers from the University of Minnesota Stem Cell Institute, the Mayo Clinic, the National Institutes of Health and Johns Hopkins University.

As one prominent researcher told me, "The real irony of the President's policy is that at least 400,000 surplus frozen embryos could be used to produce stem cells for research to save lives. Instead, these surplus embryos are being thrown into the garbage and treated as medical waste."

Only 22 of the 78 stem cell lines approved by the President in 2001 remain today. This limit on research has stunted progress on finding cures for a number of debilitating and fatal diseases according to scientists and patient advocacy groups.

Mr. Speaker, the scientific evidence is overwhelming that embryonic stem cells have great potential to regenerate specific types of human tissues, offering hope for millions of Americans suffering from debilitating diseases.

Mr. Speaker, it's too late for my beloved mother who was totally debilitated by Alzheimer's disease which led to her death. It's too late for my cousin who died a cruel, tragic death from diabetes in his 20s.

But it's not too late for 100 million other American people counting on us to support funding for life-saving research on stem cells derived from donated surplus embryos created through in vitro fertilization.

Let's not turn our backs on these people. Let's not take away their hope. Let's make it clear that abortion politics should not determine this critical medical research.

Embryonic stem cell research will prolong life, improve life and give hope for life to millions of people.

I urge members to override the President's veto of funding for life-saving and life-enhancing embryonic stem cell research.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, this institution is often called the people's House and today I ask my colleagues to stand in the shoes of the millions of people dealing with incurable or debilitating diseases. Diseases such as juvenile diabetes, Parkinson's, Alzheimer's, multiple sclerosis, or cancer. Diseases that impact them every day . . . their plans for the future.

Let us stand with them today and vote to override the President's veto of the medical research that holds the potential to find a treatment to improve their lives, or, over time, a cure.

The U.S. House has approved this legislation. The Senate has approved this legislation. The reason the American people—72 percent of them in public surveys—support the Federal Government proceeding with this legislation is because in virtually every family there is a life experience with the need for medical breakthroughs.

We can never guarantee the results of scientific research, but without it we guarantee there can be no results.

The President's stem cell policy is not working. Of the 78 existing stem cell lines permitted for use in federally funded research, only 22 of these lines are currently used for research, and many have raised concerns that these lines are genetically unstable, contaminated, and harder to work with than newer lines. Research is practically at a standstill in this country.

The Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act is a well-crafted, bipartisan approach. It is opposed with false arguments that divide Americans when what is involved is an expansion of research on embryonic stem cell lines derived from surplus embryos that were originally created for fertility treatments purposes, are in excess of clinical need and would otherwise be discarded, and have been donated by the individuals seeking fertility treatment through written consent and without any financial involvement.

Let us override the President's veto and take these vitals steps to tap into the promise

of research that has the potential to change the face of modern medicine as we know it today. That is a human value that should not be undermined by the people's representatives.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, last year, I was proud to cosponsor and vote in favor of the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act, which will expand the Federal policy and implement stricter ethical guidelines for this research.

Embryonic stem cell research is necessary to discover the causes of a myriad of genetic diseases, to test new drug therapies more efficiently on laboratory tissue instead of human volunteers, and to staving off the ravages of disease with the regeneration of our bodies' essential organs.

President George W. Bush's policy on stem cell research limits Federal funding only to embryonic stem cell lines that were derived by August 9, 2001, the date of his policy announcement.

Of the 78 stem cell lines promised by President Bush, only 22 are available to researchers.

Unfortunately these stem cell lines are aged and contaminated with mouse feeder cells, making their therapeutic use for humans uncertain. According to the majority of scientists, if these stem cell lines were transplanted into people, they would provoke dangerous viruses in humans.

What is even more disturbing is the fact that there are at least 125 new stem cell lines, which are more pristine than the lines currently available on the National Institutes of Health registry, and which are ineligible for Federally-funded research because they were derived after August 9, 2001.

This restrictive embryonic stem cell research policy is making it increasingly more difficult to attract new scientists to this area of research because of concerns that funding restrictions will keep this research from being successful.

The Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act, which passed the House on May 25, 2005, simply seeks to lift the cutoff date for lines available for research.

H.R. 810 will also strengthen the ethical standards guiding the Federal research on stem cell lines and will ensure that embryos donated for stem cell research were created for the purposes of in vitro fertilization, were in excess of clinical need, would have otherwise been discarded and involved no financial inducement.

Contrary to what opponents have been saying, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act will not Federally fund the destruction of embryos.

This measure makes it clear that unused embryos will be used for embryonic stem cell research only by decision of the donor. No Federally-funded research will be supported by this measure on any embryos that had been created solely for research purposes.

In February 2005, the Civil Society Institute conducted a nationwide survey of 1,022 adults and found that 70 percent supported bipartisan federal legislation to promote embryonic stem cell research.

Let public interest triumph over ideological special interests. Public interest is best served when the medical and the scientific community is free to exercise its professional judgment in extending and enhancing human life.

I urge the Senate to pass the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act with overwhelming

support, and for President Bush to sign it into law when it reaches his desk.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, the argument that embryonic stem cell research can contribute to life-saving research is emotionally persuasive, but it is never justifiable to deliberately end one life, even to save others. There are alternative sources of stem cells without engaging in research that purposefully takes a life. We debated an alternative stem cell bill on this floor yesterday, and it is unfortunate it did not get the support of those Members here today crying aloud how we are denying vital lifesaving research.

Furthermore, we are already funding such research. In 2001, President Bush announced federal funding for the embryonic stem cell lines that had already been created. There are 78 of these approved lines and only 22 of them are currently being used in federally funded research. These lines are so useful that they are used in 85 percent of the published embryonic stem cell studies in the world.

In fact, President Bush's policy is generous. In 2005 NIH spent \$38 million, up \$13 million from 2004. Most importantly, the current ban on embryonic research does not prevent private funding for embryonic stem cell research. Microsoft Chairman Bill Gates and Newport Beach bond trader Bill Gross are among several private donors who have provided millions of dollars toward embryonic stem cell research.

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

It is unnecessary and morally offensive to use taxpayer money to expand embryonic stem cell research. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting President Bush's veto.

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this effort to override the President's veto of H.R. 810, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this important legislation, which expands stem cell research and ensures that the federal government can implement ethical guidelines.

This bill will provide hope and opportunity for millions of Americans suffering from chronic and life threatening health conditions. This legislation will also ensure that the federal government can implement ethical guidelines over federally-funded research, which will help to set high standards for all research. To be clear, H.R. 810 only allows federal funding for embryonic stem cell research in cases where the cells were created for fertility treatment and will otherwise be discarded.

The expansion of funding to stem cell research has the power to make a real difference in the lives of Americans. Stem cells offer remarkable potential contributions to medical science and improve the lives of millions of people who suffer from incurable diseases such as juvenile diabetes, Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, AIDS, and spinal cord injuries. It may also help us to understand abnormal cell

growth that occurs in cancer, as well as change the way we develop drugs and test them for safety and potential efficacy.

It is imperative that we move our health care policy in a new direction and support efforts to improve the quality of life. This research is supported by 72 percent of Americans and the majority of the Congress. H.R. 810 is supported by over 200 patient groups, universities, and scientific societies, and has been endorsed by more than 75 national and local newspapers and 80 Nobel Laureates.

For President Bush to use his first veto to ignore this overwhelming support for stem cell research and at the same time extinguish the hopes of millions for cures to chronic and dangerous diseases is an outrage. This veto has made it clear that President Bush has chosen radical ideology over American lives. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting to override this misguided veto.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of overriding the President's veto of the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act of 2005.

I am extremely disappointed that the President exercised his first veto on a piece of bipartisan legislation that will provide countless number of Americans hope of finding cures for many life-threatening diseases. This Congress has passed many pieces of irresponsible legislation that benefit narrow special interests at the expense of the public good. The President did not veto any of those bills. Now the Congress has finally passed a bipartisan bill that will help find cures to diseases that strike virtually every American family. Yet the President has chosen to veto this landmark bill. In doing so, the President is playing to the extreme right of his own political party. Shame on the President for putting politics over the health of the American people.

We should allow the expansion of federally supported research of human embryonic stem cell lines. The Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act of 2005 would provide federal funding for a wider range of stem cell research while establishing ethical guidelines. The bill also provides that embryos that are otherwise likely to be discarded can be used to develop treatments for debilitating diseases and life-saving cures.

I believe stem cell research holds the promise of scientific breakthroughs that could improve the lives of millions of Americans afflicted with a debilitating disease—such as Parkinson's, diabetes, spinal cord injuries, autoimmune diseases, cardiovascular disease, and cancer—for which there is currently no cure. While it is too late for those who have passed from these terrible diseases, it still not too late for the millions of other Americans hoping that the Congress will override the President's veto and support federally funded research of this potentially life-saving resource. For these patients and their families, stem cell research is the last hope for a cure.

Mr. Speaker, this is an issue that affects every family in America. I strongly urge my House colleagues to vote to override the President's veto on this bipartisan legislation.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, ethical, embryonic stem cell research is a reality. The federal government has two options. We can engage, by participating in the research and influencing the ethical debate within the global community. Or, we ignore the issue and let others lead.

America is the world leader in medical research and development. We cannot cede this ground.

That is why we must be unyielding in our support for the embryonic stem cell research made possible under H.R. 810. And why I would caution my colleagues against accepting any of the weak alternatives being debated.

Mr. Speaker, one of the great equalizers is disease. It ignores age, income and education level. Embryonic stem cell research has the potential to cure and maybe even prevent many debilitating conditions affecting the old and the young, the rich and the poor. Like Diabetes. Parkinson's disease. Alzheimer's. Spinal cord damage. And maybe even bone marrow failure. Families from all walks of life have first-hand experience with these tragedies.

Make no mistake, these potential breakthroughs lie at the end of a long and difficult road. But the research community is committed to this task. Just last week in my hometown of Sacramento, the UC Davis Medical Center hired a top national expert in regenerative medicine to direct the Center's new stem cell research facility.

But every stem cell researcher agrees that this research must use embryonic stem cells. These are the only cells with the flexibility and the potential to fix spinal cord injuries, or cure diabetes. And using the unused embryos from in vitro fertilization clinics gives us an ethical way to obtain them.

Mr. Speaker, it is true that this is a debate about what science tells about stem cell research. And equally, it is about the ethical constraints our democracy rightly agrees to impose on that science. But there is broad consensus on these two points. That consensus is enshrined in H.R. 810.

So the federal government must decide whether it will lend its tremendous weight to embryonic stem cell research. Or whether it will simply remain on the sidelines, pretending that ethical solutions don't exist.

Earlier today, President Bush chose the sidelines. He chose to ignore the issue and allow others to lead. Worse still, he is stifling the hopes of millions of Americans.

And fundamentally, this is a debate about hope. Hope is the light that keeps us going through a dark and torturous tunnel.

I urge my colleagues to think very hard before denying that hope to millions of people across America by supporting anything less than federally-funded embryonic stem cell research. I hope my colleagues will vote to override the President's veto. It is time to go in a new direction.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, This debate on H.R. 810, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act, is really one of the most fundamentally important debates that this body can undertake.

H.R. 810 addresses the most basic, essential ethical issues—life, when does it begin, and when should life, including human embryos, be open to experimentation and scientific research.

It is society's ethical obligation to draw boundaries around the possibilities of science. I believe we must draw a boundary that says "no" to embryonic stem cell research that requires the killing of embryos that if left to grow would become children. Children who would grow up to become police officers, factory workers, soldiers, government employees, lawyers, doctors, and scientists.

I believe that embryos, as life, should be treated with as much respect as you and I, and I reject the view that embryos are mere medical waste, as some have suggested.

Where do we draw the line as a Nation, and say, we will not cross that line? These proponents of H.R. 810 would not have us draw a line. This legislation leaves too many questions unanswered.

When do embryos become human life? After 40 hours? After 2 days? H.R. 810 is silent on when embryos become human life—it doesn't specify how long these embryos are allowed to grow before they are killed—2 days, 5 days, 14 days, or more!

Proponents of H.R. 810 will claim that their legislation will address the "ethical manner" in which this research will be conducted, yet their legislation is silent on the ethics, other than a subsection that directs the secretary to create guidelines in 60 days or less.

As elected leaders, we should set basic guidelines, not leave the guidelines to an unelected and unnamed administration official.

This legislation is unethical and unnecessary. Human embryonic stem cell research is completely legal today in the private sector and eligible for state funding in several states, including California and New Jersey. Since August 2001, over 128 stem cell lines have been created.

Furthermore, human embryonic stem cell research is funded by the federal government today. The National Institutes of Health (NIH) spent an estimated \$38 million on Embryonic Stem Cell research in Fiscal Year 2006. 22 human embryonic stem cell lines are currently receiving federal funds. These lines are sufficient for basic research according to NIH director, Dr. Zerhouni.

Finally, embryonic stem cell research remains unproven. Not a single therapy has been developed from embryonic stem cell research. Instead of cures, embryonic stem cell research has led to tumors and deaths in animal studies.

While the promise of embryonic stem cells is questionable, adult stem cells are being used today to save lives. Recognizing this, the National Institutes of Health spent \$568 million in Fiscal Year 2006 on adult stem cell research.

Adult stem cells are being used today in clinical trials and in clinical practice to treat 72 diseases including, Parkinson's disease, spinal cord injury, juvenile diabetes, brain cancer, breast cancer, lymphoma, heart damage, rheumatoid arthritis, juvenile arthritis, stroke, and sickle cell anemia.

Let me be clear, I am committed to funding ethical scientific research that will unlock the origins of diseases and develop cures that can help my constituents.

But we cannot let science leap-frog our ethics, our morals, and our legal system.

This is not a partisan issue, and it's bigger than a right to life issue.

I urge Members to vote against H.R. 810 and sustain the President's veto.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, the possibility is real that embryonic stem-cell research represents the greatest breakthrough in the history of science. It is, therefore, important that we understand the medical and moral issues at stake.

In 1998, University of Wisconsin scientists for the first time isolated embryonic stem cells in a laboratory. These cells, 30 to 34 in number, are derived from a blastocyst, which is a

group of 150 to 200 cells smaller than the dot at the end of this sentence. A blastocyst, in turn, is derived from a single cell known as a zygote, which comes into being after a sperm and an egg combine.

Blastocysts have been created outside of the body in cell cultures for decades in fertility clinics. More than 400,000 are known to exist in frozen form. Thousands are discarded as medical waste and millions are eliminated naturally every year.

The reason the scientific community is so excited about embryonic stem cells is that they are pluripotent. Unlike other stem cells, they are capable of continuously dividing and being coaxed into forming virtually any of several hundred types of body cells. Health research is conducted in stages—mice before people. At the moment, scientists are encouraged by the results they have obtained from the animal kingdom. Research on mice, pigs and monkeys is so promising that scientists can envision the possibility of creating “cellular repair kits” for the human body. If research is supported the regenerative power of embryonic stem cells may soon be harnessed to treat ailments as diverse as spinal-cord injury, diabetes, Alzheimer’s, Parkinson’s, multiple sclerosis and heart disease.

Profound moral questions encompass embryonic stem-cell research. A blastocyst, which is subject to scientific engineering on a Petri dish, could, if implanted in a uterus, cause a life to form. “Excess” blastocysts also could be adopted. As the father of adopted children, I confess to personal enthusiasm for this option.

Nevertheless, the ethical question must be addressed: Is it more moral to throw away as medical waste blastocysts that exceed demand for implanting, or to allow them to be used by scientists to extract therapies for saving life?

More precisely, which is more pro-life: throwing a blastocyst away in a dumpster or placing it on a Petri dish to develop a remedy for heart disease?

The question today is about science and its promise. Tomorrow, a different set of questions may have to be addressed. Could a mother deny a child dying of cancer access to embryonic stem-cell therapy? Could a son or daughter deny a parent suffering from Alzheimer’s or Parkinson’s disease access to such therapies? Is it not pro-life to save and prolong life?

On most political issues compromise is possible. On ethics, it is not so easy. Indeed, uncompromising approaches to ethics are generally considered admirable. The problem comes when values, as in this case, are in conflict.

Morality is about means as well as ends. For citizens who believe nothing is more important than to protect life at conception, embryonic stem-cell research may be intolerable. For citizens who believe that the prospect of meaningful life begins in a mother, not a Petri dish, the moral imperative of attending the sick and alleviating illness is compelling.

When one group of Americans considers embryonic stem-cell research immoral and another finds it ethically problematic to refuse to seek credible cures for life-threatening disease, the public goal can never be full agreement. But it can be mutual respect.

One approach which this legislation advances is the notion of authorizing federal

support for stem cell research involving only those lines derived from blastocysts that would otherwise be thrown away and that were not initially created for the purpose of research.

I recognized that for some even this restrained approach amounts to hubris, to man tampering with nature. But this is what modern science is about: Care, to be sure, must be taken, particularly at this stage of scientific development, not to attempt to clone human life or toy with human reproduction. But careful, moral exploration into disease control is morally defensible. Indeed, for many of us it would be morally derelict to turn our backs on our ailing parents and sick children.

Hence, I am compelled to vote to override this veto.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution, this vote must be by the yeas and nays.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 193, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 388]

YEAS—235

Abercrombie	Cummings	Jackson-Lee
Ackerman	Davis (AL)	(TX)
Allen	Davis (CA)	Jefferson
Andrews	Davis (FL)	Johnson (CT)
Baca	Davis (IL)	Johnson, E. B.
Baird	Davis, Tom	Jones (OH)
Baldwin	DeFazio	Kanjorski
Barrow	DeGette	Kelly
Barton (TX)	Delahunt	Kennedy (RI)
Bass	DeLauro	Kilpatrick (MI)
Bean	Dent	Kind
Becerra	Dicks	Kirk
Berkley	Dingell	Kolbe
Berman	Dogett	Kucinich
Berry	Doyle	Langevin
Biggert	Dreier	Lantos
Bilbray	Edwards	Larsen (WA)
Bishop (GA)	Emanuel	Larson (CT)
Bishop (NY)	Emerson	LaTourette
Blumenauer	Engel	Leach
Boehert	Eshoo	Lee
Bono	Etheridge	Levin
Boren	Farr	Lewis (CA)
Boswell	Fattah	Lofgren, Zoe
Boucher	Filner	Lowey
Boyd	Foley	Lynch
Bradley (NH)	Ford	Mack
Brady (PA)	Fossella	Maloney
Brown (OH)	Frank (MA)	Markey
Brown, Corrine	Frelinghuysen	Matheson
Brown-Waite,	Gerlach	Matsui
Ginny	Gibbons	McCarthy
Butterfield	Gilchrest	McCollum (MN)
Calvert	Gonzalez	McDermott
Capito	Gordon	McGovern
Capps	Granger	McKeon
Capuano	Green, Al	McNulty
Cardin	Green, Gene	Meehan
Cardoza	Grijalva	Meek (FL)
Carmahan	Harman	Meeks (NY)
Carson	Hastings (FL)	Melancon
Case	Herseth	Michaud
Castle	Higgin	Millender-
Chandler	Hinche	McDonald
Clay	Hinojosa	Miller (NC)
Cleaver	Holt	Miller, George
Clyburn	Honda	Moore (KS)
Coble	Hooley	Moore (WI)
Conyers	Hoyer	Moran (VA)
Cooper	Inslee	Murtha
Costa	Israel	Nadler
Cramer	Issa	Napolitano
Crowley	Jackson (IL)	Neal (MA)
Cuellar		Obey

Olver	Sánchez, Linda	Thompson (CA)
Ortiz	T.	Thompson (MS)
Owens	Sanchez, Loretta	Tierney
Pallone	Sanders	Towns
Pascrell	Schakowsky	Udall (CO)
Pastor	Schiff	Udall (NM)
Payne	Schwartz (PA)	Upton
Pelosi	Schwarz (MI)	Van Hollen
Platts	Scott (GA)	Velázquez
Pomeroy	Scott (VA)	Vislosky
Porter	Serrano	Walden (OR)
Price (NC)	Shaw	Wasserman
Pryce (OH)	Shays	Schultz
Ramstad	Sherman	Waters
Rangel	Simmons	Watson
Regula	Skelton	Watt
Reichert	Slaughter	Waxman
Reyes	Smith (WA)	Weiner
Rohrabacher	Snyder	Weldon (PA)
Ross	Solis	Wexler
Rothman	Spratt	Wilson (NM)
Roybal-Allard	Stark	Woolsey
Ruppersberger	Strickland	Wu
Rush	Sweeney	Wynn
Ryan (OH)	Tanner	Young (AK)
Sabo	Tauscher	
Salazar	Thomas	

NAYS—193

Aderholt	Hall	Nunes
Akin	Harris	Nussle
Alexander	Hart	Oberstar
Bachus	Hastert	Osborne
Baker	Hastings (WA)	Otter
Barrett (SC)	Hayes	Oxley
Bartlett (MD)	Hayworth	Paul
Beauprez	Hefley	Pearce
Bilirakis	Hensarling	Pence
Bishop (UT)	Herger	Peterson (MN)
Blackburn	Hobson	Peterson (PA)
Blunt	Hoekstra	Petri
Boehner	Holden	Pickering
Bonilla	Hostettler	Pitts
Bonner	Hulshof	Poe
Boozman	Hunter	Pombo
Boustany	Hyde	Price (GA)
Brady (TX)	Inglis (SC)	Putnam
Brown (SC)	Istook	Radanovich
Burgess	Jenkins	Rahall
Burton (IN)	Jindal	Rehberg
Buyer	Johnson (IL)	Renzi
Camp (MI)	Johnson, Sam	Reynolds
Campbell (CA)	Jones (NC)	Rogers (AL)
Cannon	Kaptur	Rogers (KY)
Cantor	Keller	Rogers (MI)
Carter	Kennedy (MN)	Ros-Lehtinen
Chabot	Kildee	Royce
Chocola	King (IA)	Ryan (WI)
Cole (OK)	King (NY)	Ryun (KS)
Conaway	Kingston	Saxton
Costello	Kline	Schmidt
Crenshaw	Knollenberg	Sensenbrenner
Cubin	Kuhl (NY)	Sessions
Culberson	LaHood	Shadegg
Davis (KY)	Latham	Sherwood
Davis (TN)	Lewis (KY)	Shimkus
Davis, Jo Ann	Linder	Shuster
Deal (GA)	Lipinski	Simpson
Diaz-Balart, L.	LoBiondo	Smith (NJ)
Diaz-Balart, M.	Lucas	Smith (TX)
Doolittle	Lungren, Daniel	Sodrel
Drake	E.	Souder
Duncan	Manzullo	Stearns
Ehlers	Marchant	Stupak
English (PA)	Marshall	Sullivan
Everett	McCaul (TX)	Tancredo
Feeney	McCotter	Taylor (MS)
Ferguson	McHenry	Taylor (NC)
Fitzpatrick (PA)	McHugh	Terry
Flake	McIntyre	Thornberry
Forbes	McMorris	Tiahrt
Fortenberry	Mica	Tiberi
Fox	Miller (FL)	Turner
Franks (AZ)	Miller (MI)	Walsh
Gallely	Miller, Gary	Wamp
Garrett (NJ)	Mollohan	Weldon (FL)
Gillmor	Moran (KS)	Weller
Gingrey	Murphy	Westmoreland
Gohmert	Musgrave	Whitfield
Goode	Myrick	Wicker
Goodlatte	Neugebauer	Wilson (SC)
Graves	Ney	Wolf
Green (WI)	Norwood	Young (FL)
Gutknecht		

NOT VOTING—5

Evans	Lewis (GA)	Northup
Gutierrez	McKinney	

□ 1851

Mr. SULLIVAN changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. MORAN of Virginia changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So, two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof, the veto of the President was sustained and the bill was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, on account of official business in my district, I missed votes in this Chamber today. I would like the RECORD to show that, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall votes 384, 387, and 388. I would have voted “no” on rollcall votes 382, 383, 385, and 386.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The message and the bill are referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the House.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 2830, PENSION PROTECTION ACT OF 2005

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, under rule XXII, clause 7(c), I hereby announce my intention to offer a motion to instruct on H.R. 2830, the pension conference report.

The form of the motion is as follows:

I move that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2830 be instructed—

(1) to agree to the provisions contained in subsections (a) through (d) of section 601 of the Senate amendment (relating to prospective application of age discrimination, conversion, and present value assumption rules with respect to cash balance and other hybrid defined benefit plans) and not to agree with the provisions contained in title VII of the bill as passed the House (relating to benefit accrual standards); and

(2) to agree to the provisions contained in section 413 of the Senate amendment (relating to computation of guaranteed benefits of airline pilots required to separate from service prior to attaining age 65), but only with respect to plan terminations occurring on or after September 11, 2001.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken tomorrow. The postponed vote on H. Con. Res. 448 will also be taken tomorrow.

CONDEMNING THE RECENT ATTACKS AGAINST THE STATE OF ISRAEL

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 921) condemning the recent attacks against the State of Israel, holding terrorists and their state-sponsors accountable for such attacks, supporting Israel's right to defend itself, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 921

Whereas on September 12, 2005, Israel completed its unilateral withdrawal from Gaza, demonstrating its willingness to make sacrifices for the sake of peace;

Whereas more than 1,000 rockets have been launched from Gaza into Israel since Israel's disengagement;

Whereas in a completely unprovoked attack that occurred in undisputed Israeli territory on June 25, 2006, Israeli Defense Forces Corporal Gilad Shalit was kidnapped and is being held hostage in Gaza by a Palestinian terrorist group which includes members of Hamas;

Whereas Hamas political leader Khaled Meshaal, in Damascus, Syria, has acknowledged the role of Hamas in holding Corporal Shalit hostage;

Whereas in a completely unprovoked attack that occurred in undisputed Israeli territory on July 12, 2006, operatives of the terrorist group Hezbollah operating out of southern Lebanon killed three Israeli soldiers and took two others hostage;

Whereas Israel fully complied with United Nations Security Council Resolution 425 (1978) by completely withdrawing its forces from Lebanon, as certified by the United Nations Security Council and affirmed by United Nations Secretary-General Kofi Annan on June 16, 2000, when he said, “Israel has withdrawn from [Lebanon] in full compliance with Security Council Resolution 425.”;

Whereas United Nations Security Council Resolution 1559 (2004) calls for the complete withdrawal of all foreign forces from Lebanon and the dismantlement of all independent militias in Lebanon;

Whereas despite the adoption of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1559, the Government of Lebanon has failed to disband and disarm Hezbollah, allowing Hezbollah instead to amass 13,000 rockets, including rockets that are more destructive, longer-range and more accurate than rockets previously used by Hezbollah, and has integrated Hezbollah into the Lebanese Government;

Whereas the Government of Israel has previously shown great restraint despite the fact that Hezbollah has launched at least four separate attacks into Israel using rockets and ground forces over the past year;

Whereas the failure of the Government of Lebanon to implement all aspects of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1559 and to extend its authority throughout its territory has enabled Hezbollah to launch armed attacks against Israel and recently to kidnap Israeli soldiers;

Whereas Hezbollah's strength derives significantly from the direct financial, military, and political support it receives from Syria and Iran, and Hezbollah also receives important support from sources within Lebanon;

Whereas Iranian Revolutionary Guards continue to operate in southern Lebanon, providing support to Hezbollah and reportedly controlling its operational activities;

Whereas the Government of the United States has enacted several laws, including

the Syria Accountability and Lebanese Sovereignty Restoration Act of 2003 (Public Law 108-175) and the Iran and Libya Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172), which call for the imposition of sanctions on Syria and Iran for, among other things, their support for terrorism and terrorist organizations;

Whereas the House of Representatives has repeatedly called for full implementation of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1559;

Whereas section 1224 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107-228) withholds certain assistance to Lebanon contingent on the deployment of the Lebanese armed forces to the internationally recognized border between Lebanon and Israel and its effective assertion of authority in the border area in order, among other reasons, to prevent cross-border infiltration by terrorists, precisely the criminal activity that has provoked the current crisis;

Whereas President George W. Bush stated on July 12, 2006, “Hezbollah's terrorist operations threaten Lebanon's security and are an affront to the sovereignty of the Lebanese Government. Hezbollah's actions are not in the interest of the Lebanese people, whose welfare should not be held hostage to the interests of the Syrian and Iranian regimes.”, and has repeatedly affirmed that Syria and Iran must be held to account for their shared responsibility in the recent attacks;

Whereas the United States recognizes that some members of the democratically-elected Lebanese parliament are working to build an autonomous and sovereign Lebanon and supports their efforts; and

Whereas both Hezbollah and Hamas refuse to recognize Israel's right to exist and call for the destruction of Israel: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) reaffirms its steadfast support for the State of Israel;

(2) condemns Hamas and Hezbollah for engaging in unprovoked and reprehensible armed attacks against Israel on undisputed Israeli territory, for taking hostages, for killing Israeli soldiers, and for continuing to indiscriminately target Israeli civilian populations with their rockets and missiles;

(3) further condemns Hamas and Hezbollah for cynically exploiting civilian populations as shields, locating their equipment and bases of operation, including their rockets and other armaments, amidst civilian populations, including in homes and mosques;

(4) recognizes Israel's longstanding commitment to minimizing civilian loss and welcomes Israel's continued efforts to prevent civilian casualties;

(5) demands the Governments of Iran and Syria to direct Hamas and Hezbollah to immediately and unconditionally release Israeli soldiers which they hold captive;

(6) affirms that all governments that have provided continued support to Hamas or Hezbollah share responsibility for the hostage-taking and attacks against Israel and, as such, should be held accountable for their actions;

(7) condemns the Governments of Iran and Syria for their continued support for Hezbollah and Hamas in their armed attacks against Israelis and their other terrorist activities;

(8) supports Israel's right to take appropriate action to defend itself, including to conduct operations both in Israel and in the territory of nations which pose a threat to it, which is in accordance with international law, including Article 51 of the United Nations Charter;