

support human embryonic stem cell research. Well of course not, there is a federal moratorium on the research! These cells were only recently isolated, the first grant applications were due at NIH last March, and then the administration placed everything on hold. If they ever allow the research to proceed with full urgency, there will be clinical success.

Furthermore, my colleagues are regrettably misleading and not up-to-date with the scientific literature. There are in fact numerous studies using animal models that demonstrate the tremendous therapeutic promise of embryonic stem cells. These findings challenge much of what I learned in medical school. For instance, medical dogma for decades accepted no hope for so many neurological disorders.

For example, scientists have been able to transform embryonic stem cells derived from mice into the type of neuron that is defective with Parkinson's disease. We know that these neurons work when placed in animals. That is, when these neurons, which were originally derived from embryonic stem cells, are injected into an animal model of Parkinson's, the animal improves.

Have any doubts? Here is the scientific paper that describes these promising results.

Similarly, researchers have transformed embryonic stem cells into the cell which, when defective causes MS. When this cell was implanted into an animal model with MS, the abnormality was repaired.

And here is a scientific paper that demonstrates those findings.

Both of these examples demonstrate the therapeutic potential of embryonic stem cells. Researchers have taken embryonic stem cells and turned them into a desired cell that works. These cells are implanted into animal models with different illnesses, and the animals get better.

Lets turn to diabetes. This paper describes a study whereby embryonic stem cells are transformed into pancreatic islet stem cells. These islet cells responded to sugar in the right way by producing insulin.

For those who say the evidence is lacking, I say, get your head out of the sand. The evidence most definitely is out there.

The prevailing expert scientific opinion supports a thorough investigation of stem cells from all sources. Even the recently released NIH report recognized the unique potential of embryonic stem cells. But for the White house, it is not about advancing scientific discovery. Instead, their concern for the "swing vote" is their modus operandi. For them, this debate is unfortunately about the next election.

Embryonic stem cells are derived from embryos that are produced during in vitro fertilization, a process that creates many more fertilized eggs than are implanted into women trying to become pregnant. Unused embryos are stored frozen in test tubes and eventually thrown away. Embryonic stem cell research would use only these excess embryos, obtained from fertility clinics and with consent from the donors.

In other words, if the research were not performed, these embryos would be discarded. And how many embryos would be "saved" if the research did not take place? The answer is none. Opponents argue for embryonic adoption. But for the most part, the vast majority of couples do not want to donate their genes to strangers. No policy made in the White House

or in Congress will result in these couples changing their minds.

Thus, we are having a debate over whether to perform life-saving research or to dispose of the embryos and abandon the greatest hope for a cure for so many devastating illnesses.

Those opposed to embryonic stem cell research assert that their position is based on ethical and moral grounds. But what is so ethical or moral about prohibiting research to alleviate human suffering? It is utterly hypocritical and outrageous that the opposition remains silent over the fact that these embryos are thrown away in fertility clinics, but conveys such fury over saving them to perform vital life-saving research.

How can we compare the importance of a group of cells smaller than the dot at the end of this sentence with the poor quality of life and decreased life expectancy for young children with insulin-dependent diabetes? In fact, it is completely amoral to deny access to the single most promising research of today.

The Administration lacks support from many members of its own party, with several conservative pro-life Republicans openly supportive of embryonic stem cell research. When Orin Hatch insists that a frozen embryo stored in a refrigerator in a clinic is not equivalent to an embryo or a fetus in the womb, the Administration's facade of having a commitment to promote innovative medical research is completely undermined.

Banning federal funding for such embryonic stem cell research would not eliminate it. Ironically, such research would then take place in the private market without the benefit of ethical regulation. Under the Clinton Administration, the National Institute of Health issued explicit guidelines for embryonic stem cell research. The guidelines provide stringent requirements that enable scientists to conduct research within the constraints of careful federal oversight.

Prohibiting federal support for embryonic stem cell research will severely impede medical progress. Federal support is critical because it would greatly expand resources. Not only would the government provide crucial funding, but public support also enables multiple parties to simultaneously pursue critical research, thereby increasing the chances for significant discoveries over a shorter period of time. Without federal support, scientific advances would be held hostage to exclusivity rights held by a single entity in the private market.

Furthermore, very few NIH grants were received this past March because investigators fear that the guidelines will be overturned. Without federal support, scientists who work with embryonic stem cells must create a separate lab for such work if they hope to ever receive NIH grants for other areas of research. This is to avoid the possibility of "contaminating" equipment for sanctioned research with that of embryonic stem cell research. The ramifications of banning this research will therefore be felt in scientific discoveries far beyond the stem cell debate.

Actually, we are already witnessing the consequences, as the exodus of our best and brightest minds has begun. A few weeks ago, UCSF (University of California at San Francisco) lost a leading stem cell researcher who moved to Cambridge, England. He left so that he can proceed with his work. As the university's chancellor for medical affairs said: "If

federal support for stem cell research is not forthcoming, the risk exists that talented scientists will leave academic centers to seek opportunities in the private sector or even overseas."

America has been on the forefront of scientific discovery. The administration is jeopardizing our position and taking us several steps backward to assuage the fundamentalist attitudes of the minority.

The White House is currently "reviewing" the matter; in other words, they are assessing the polls and the impact of any decision on the 2004 elections. It is not secret that Mr. Rove has consulted the National Conference of Catholic Bishops on this issue. Enough time has been wasted. The Administration must act now to separate political aspirations from scientific discovery.

"A responsible leader is someone who makes decisions based upon principle, not based upon polls or focus groups." The New York Times reminds us that President Bush spoke these words a few days before Election Day. Perhaps someone should remind the President.

I implore my colleagues and this administration to support embryonic stem cell research. Furthermore, I urge you to support my bill—"The Stem Cell Research Act of 2001" (H.R. 2059). This bill not only supports this crucial research, but it also advocates for federal support of the derivation process itself. That is, instead of relying on private companies to derive the stem cells, we must support and fund this process as well.

I want to close in the issue of morality. Here is a real-life picture of what we are talking about. This is a picture of an embryo, magnified several thousand times. This area here, between the 8 and 10 o'clock position is the area from which stem cells are obtained. It actually contains about 100 cells. There are more cells in a drop of blood from a pin-prick than there are in this one section of the photo.

And here is Mr. Christopher Reeve with a young child—both of whom who were tragically paralyzed.

Are we going to ignore Mr. Reeve and this child? I fervently believe that the moral obligation is to help these individuals and the millions of Americans who are suffering from debilitating illnesses and disabilities. We must focus on those already born who urgently await medical progress.

For the first time ever, cures for so many afflictions that historically have been considered hopeless are now on the horizon. The fact is that embryonic stem cells come from cells that were destined to be discarded in any case. It is high time to separate politics from science.

A FEW THOUGHTS ON ENERGY

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

Mr. EHRLICH. Mr. Speaker, a few thoughts on energy.

Last night we acknowledged our duty as responsible stewards of America's economy in putting forth a sound energy policy that respects and protects our environment.

We adopted a long-term energy strategy, and it was balanced, Mr. Speaker,

between conservation and investments in renewable, nonrenewable, and nuclear sources. We never lost sight of our responsibility for the health and vitality of our environment.

H.R. 4 places confidence in America's ability to develop technologies and market incentives to address our energy need in an environmentally safe and cost-effective manner. Americans rely on clean, abundant, and affordable energy, Mr. Speaker. All of us want a strong economy and a clean, healthy environment.

Last night, this House reaffirmed its commitment to these principles. Further, last night's vote was more than drilling for oil or CAFE standards or gasoline additives.

We refused to reward oil-producing nations openly hostile to the United States of America. We said no to OPEC's political whims in setting the world price for oil. We said no to taking away consumer choice in preference and safety that would have eliminated tens of thousands of jobs, good jobs, Mr. Speaker, for American workers.

We did much more. We created a balanced strategy for America's national economic security and environmental need. We laid the groundwork to break this Nation's dangerous dependency on foreign oil through investments in alternative and renewable energies such as fuel cells, wind, solar, geothermal, biomass, and fusion energy.

We spoke up, Mr. Speaker, for those in our society whose voice is seldom heard, poor, low-income Americans, by reauthorizing and improving upon the Low-income Home Energy Assistance Program, the so-called LIHEAP program, and weatherization programs.

Mr. Speaker, we approved H.R. 4 last night. It is a responsible, balanced energy strategy which recognizes the need for conservation, alternative energy, and a healthy environment. This was a great day for America. It was a critical day for Marylanders, particularly, and for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from the great State of Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank my colleague for yielding to me, Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate his remarks on legislation on energy.

One other part of that legislation had to do with the Buy Indian Act for the first Americans, involving the first Americans in energy transmission and production, and a myriad of other activities that will help bring economic vitality to the reservations and sovereign nations.

CONCERN ABOUT SIDS AND NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBES

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to speak of another concern shared by all Americans, but especially the first Americans. That would be SIDS, or Sudden Infant Death Syndrome. SIDS can happen to any family and is one of the major causes of death in babies from 1 month to 1 year of age.

SIDS is used to describe the unexplained death of an infant, and the cause of this condition is not known at this time. Researchers continue to investigate this mysterious and tragic syndrome.

Congress has a special trust responsibility to assure the highest possible health status for Native Americans. Despite this trust responsibility, Native Americans and Alaska natives continue to bear a disproportionate burden of illness and premature mortality in comparison with other populations in the United States.

I am extremely concerned about SIDS because this tragic syndrome is the leading cause of infant mortality among Native Americans and Alaska natives.

CONCERN ABOUT SIDS AND NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBES

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, specific risk factors have been identified, and through identification and implementation of learned actions, there is a potential reduction in the incidence rate of SIDS by up to 40 percent. Infant mortality rates among Native Americans in Indian Health Service areas was 9.3 versus 7.6 in the United States for all races.

Now, understand that among Native Americans, that means the incidence of infant mortality is 22 percent higher. The areas in Tucson, Aberdeen, and Nashville exceeded the U.S. rate by over 50 percent. Infant mortality for SIDS in Indian Health Service areas average 2.3 times greater than all races in the United States, and three times the Caucasian rate.

As I mentioned earlier, Mr. Speaker, the cause of SIDS is not known at this time. Researchers continue their important work to investigate and to understand and to try to prevent this syndrome. It is known that behavior modification and risk factor awareness has proven to reduce the incidence of SIDS by up to 40 percent.

Mr. Speaker, we must look to partner with the Indian Health Service, Indian Health Service Area Health Boards, Tribal health departments, and Tribal Councils to develop culturally sensitive national, regional, and local SIDS risk reduction education programs. We must develop tribally sensitive behavior modification models in tribal-specific formats, improving communication and education to high-risk mothers and caregivers.

Mr. Speaker, I would commend such organizations as CJ Foundation for SIDS as a model to raise awareness of the steps to reduce the risks of SIDS and to decrease the frequency of SIDS-related deaths.

As indicated in recent study by the Center for Disease Control and Prevention, the disparity between the health

of Native Americans and the rest of the population is ever widening.

Mr. Speaker, we must work for public health for the special Tribal trust relationship between the Government of the United States and the sovereign Indian nations to help solve this problem, which falls disproportionately on the first Americans.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. THOMPSON of California (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today after 9:15 p.m. and the balance of the week on account of family business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOLDEN, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. HORN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RAMSTAD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HUNTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HUTCHINSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EHLERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EHRLICH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TANCREDO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HAYWORTH, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 494. An act to provide for a transition to democracy and to promote economic recovery in Zimbabwe; to the Committee on Financial Services; in addition to the Committee on International Relations for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.