

cannot afford to wait any longer for enactment of this urgently needed legislation.

I am a strong supporter and proud co-sponsor of the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act. I have heard from many of my constituents in Wisconsin in support of this legislation, and I am glad that the Senate is addressing this today and responding to the requests of millions across the country. As the Senator from Oregon eloquently said a few minutes ago, for many people this is a deeply personal issue. When an individual or loved one suffers from an incurable disease or medical condition, it can be devastating. Everyone knows someone who has suffered from diabetes, Alzheimer's Parkinson's, or another debilitating disease, and we all know the physical and emotional pain inflicted as a result. It is vitally important that we move this legislation into law as expeditiously as possible and provide the resources that scientists need to develop treatments and cures for these diseases.

Researchers can unlock enormous potential in stem cell research if Congress will only give them the key. At the University of Wisconsin in 1998, Dr. James Thomson became the first scientist to break into this new frontier by isolating human embryonic stem cells. Since then, researchers at the university have been able to coax embryonic stem cells to develop into mature blood cells, which could provide treatments and cures for people with a range of currently incurable diseases. By further examining the potential of stem cells, scientists at the University of Wisconsin have also successfully developed neural cells, and they have even transferred these cells successfully into mice, where the cells continued to thrive. The possibilities here are clear: If technology such as this is able to expand, those with neurological disorders and bleak prognoses may now have hope.

Despite its incredible promise, this research has unfortunately been limited by the President since 2001. It is time for Congress to take the necessary action to provide more stem cell lines to scientists so that this research can go forward, without the Federal Government standing in the way.

The Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act would allow federally funded research to be conducted on stem cell lines derived from excess embryos created for in vitro fertilization, IVF, that are no longer needed and are donated by couples for research. It is estimated that there are more than 400,000 embryos that were created for fertility treatments and are likely to be destroyed.

There is much work that needs to be done to further understand the role that embryonic stem cells can play in providing answers to some of the most troubling medical diseases and conditions that affect so many Americans. The Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act will help our Nation's researchers

get closer to unlocking what this research holds by increasing the quantity and quality of stem cell lines available for research.

Embryonic stem cell research is very important to me and to Wisconsin. I am proud that the University of Wisconsin has played a prominent role in stem cell research in this country. I know that my constituents, and Americans across the country, are eagerly awaiting the benefits that this research will provide.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this incredibly important science which would expand our research horizons and bring hope to so many people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I rise today in support of H.R. 810, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act. Any one of us who has met people who have petitioned us for this act has to be moved. I have looked into the eyes of a mother who brought her beautiful 4-year-old daughter to my office and said, Senator, please allow this research to go forward because I am worried my daughter will be blind at the age of 20 without it.

I have met families whose patriarch is suffering from ALS, Lou Gehrig's disease. Again, they have pleaded with us, allow the research to go forward so maybe that person or his children, who might get the disease, will be able to be cured.

I have met with so many people my age whose parents are suffering from Alzheimer's or Parkinson's. Again, they plead with us, allow stem cell research to move forward so that maybe my parent or other parents such as mine could be cured.

Americans struggle with diseases every day. The confounding and amazing thing is, when scientists are on the edge of a breakthrough, the President stops them. Scientists are on the cusp of making incredible progress through stem cell research, a process that has the potential to cure diseases as widespread as diabetes and heart disease, but progress came to a grinding halt in 2001 when President Bush limited federally funded stem cell research to only 19 sources. With that Executive Order, President Bush shut the door on hope for millions of American families. With that one action, the President not only stopped current research in its tracks, he sent a message to future scientists that they should not pursue this line of work. As they see a limited funding stream for the work they do, fewer and fewer graduates are specializing in this kind of work. We need the best minds there.

Substantively, there is no doubt this is the right thing to do. But I put it in a broader context. There is a group of people in America of deep faith. I respect that faith. I have been in enough inner-city Black churches, working-class Catholic parishes, rural Meth-

odist houses of worship, and small Jewish synagogues, to understand that faith is a gift. The trouble with this group, which I call the theocrats, is they want that faith to dictate what our Government does. That, in a word, is un-American. It is exactly the reason the Founding Fathers put down their plows and took up muskets to fight.

If you do not like stem cell research, don't use it for yourself or your family, but don't tell millions of Americans who may not share your faith that they cannot use it, as well.

We have seen this repeatedly with Schiavo, or the required teaching of creationism in the schools, and now with stem cell research. Unfortunately, the President and too many in this Chamber and too many in the other Chamber have gone along and said that faith, wonderful and noble as it is, should determine what our Government does.

This administration is not pursuing what most Americans want, but following the dictates of the narrow few. Fortunately, we live in a democracy. In a democracy these issues are debated.

I assure everyone in this Chamber, this issue will be debated and debated strongly in November. Those who have stood in the way of scientific progress and research, those who have told that wonderful mother that her child cannot get the research she needs so she might not be blind, will be held accountable. This will be one of the largest issues that will face us in November, and it should. That is what democracy is all about. All of those, including the President, who have tried to hide their actions with false promises or bills that accomplish nothing, will be held accountable.

Thank God we have a democracy. Thank God that a narrow band of people, few in number, deep in conviction, cannot dictate what our Government does. The fact that H.R. 810 has come to the Senate, the fact that it will get a large majority of votes here as it did in the House, and the fact that the President and some of his allies in this Chamber and others have stood in the way of saving lives and of scientific progress because they believe their faith should dictate what the rest of us do—again, they will be held accountable for that.

I hope this measure passes. It would be a miracle, a miracle that could save lives if it got a veto-proof majority in this Senate. I doubt that will happen. But one can always hope, because the hopes, the futures, of millions of Americans, born and unborn, rest on us pursuing this research, doing what science tells us it needs to do to enhance and preserve life, and not be blocked by a small group that wishes to impose its views on everyone else.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now

stand in recess until the hour of 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:30 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m.; and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. VOINOVICH).

FETUS FARMING PROHIBITION
ACT OF 2006

ALTERNATIVE PLURIPOTENT
STEM CELL THERAPIES EN-
HANCEMENT ACT

STEM CELL RESEARCH ENHANCE-
MENT ACT OF 2005—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority controls the next 30 minutes.

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SANTORUM. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I would like to begin this discussion, talking about the three pieces of legislation that are before us, to talk about the one I believe is the least controversial of all; and that is the issue of fetus farming. It is a piece of legislation that I introduced, thanks to the great help of my staff, Heather MacLean, who has worked diligently on both pieces of legislation that are on the floor today that I happen to be the sponsor of, the alternatives bill as well as the fetus farming bill.

This legislation comes as a result of a recommendation from the President's Council on Bioethics. That council, as you know, is not made up of people who share the President's viewpoint on the issue of stem cell research. In fact, it is a rather diverse group. But they unanimously agreed with what they see out in the scientific world with respect to research being done—where animals are being implanted with embryos grown to a certain gestational age and then aborted for purposes of research—that this should not be allowed in humans; that we should not be developing embryos, implanting them in women, and then having those women abort the fetus for the purposes of doing research.

So the bill I have introduced follows on with the unanimous recommendation of the President's Council on Bioethics. Again, it is a diverse group. And they said: We should prohibit the transfer of a human embryo produced *ex vivo*—that is, outside of the mother's womb—to a woman's uterus for any purpose other than to attempt to produce a live-born child.

That is what the first piece of legislation does, what is referred to as the fetus farming bill. I am hopeful we can have a broad consensus, hopefully a unanimous vote, on the floor of the Senate in favor of this legislation. The House will hopefully pass that later today and the President will move forward and sign it.

The other issues I want to talk about get into a lot more detail with respect to how we deal with these very difficult

moral questions. I have heard some say on the floor of the Senate there is no moral question here. In fact, I heard the senior Senator from New York calling those who oppose this H.R. 810—which calls for the destruction of human embryos for purposes of deriving embryonic stem cells—he called people who oppose H.R. 810 theocrats.

I do not agree with the Senator from New York on a lot of things. I am sure the Senator from New York is motivated by his faith to do a lot of things in his life. I am sure there are things on the floor of the Senate for which the Senator from New York is motivated by his faith tradition and uses it as a tool which has provided him a moral framework for this world. But I would never call him a theocrat for taking that element of his faith, which he happens to believe is valuable, and applying it to a fact of circumstances before him in the Senate. So I would hope we would tone down that type of rhetoric. No one is advocating theocracy here.

But to suggest there are not moral questions at stake, I think is blatantly dishonest. There was a doctor that was on a C-SPAN program this morning, a doctor from Johns Hopkins, who was in favor of H.R. 810, who got up and said it very clearly, if you believe that killing a 5-day-old embryo is the taking of a human life, then I can understand, she said, you having problems with H.R. 810. If you do not, then I can understand why you do not have a problem with H.R. 810.

Now, to suggest that someone who happens to believe that a 5-day-old embryo, that is genetically human, that if implanted in a woman would have as good a chance as any other embryo in a woman to develop into any one of us—that we believe that killing that embryo is the taking of a human life—I am not too sure that goes into the bounds of imposing a theocracy on America.

I think that is, yes, to some degree, a moral question but I would argue, to some degree, very much a scientific question as to whether that is actually human and is it alive. And the answer is, yes, it is genetically human. It is like every one of us. And it is alive. If it were dead, no one would be implanting it, no one would be killing it. So it is human and it is alive.

You can say it is not human life. I can say this piece of paper is not a piece of paper, but that does not make it what it is not. It is human, and it is alive. Under H.R. 810, we say that the Federal Government is going to fund research dependent on the destruction, the killing of that embryo. I think it needs to be made clear there is nothing in the legislation—in fact, there is no bill I am aware of that has been introduced—that says any individual without Government dollars cannot take, cannot buy or get donated a fertilized embryo, an embryo, a 5-day-old embryo from an *in vitro* fertilization clinic and do research on it. There is no law prohibiting it. There is no law prohibiting the killing of those embryos.

All of us who have concerns about H.R. 810 have concerns because this is Federal funding for research dependent on the destruction of human life. I happen to believe that is morally objectionable. I also think it is scientifically objectionable too.

Having said that, I have one final point I would make. I do not think this position is necessarily well out of the mainstream. There was a poll taken recently. In the poll, this question was asked: Stem cells are the basic cells from which all person's tissues and organs develop. Congress is considering the question of Federal funding for experiments using stem cells from human embryos. The live embryos would be destroyed in their first week of development to obtain these cells. Do you support or oppose using Federal tax dollars for such experiments? Thirty-eight percent support; almost 48 percent oppose.

I do not think those people would be called theocrats. They are not theocrats. These are honest, hard-working Americans who see human life and say: We should treat it with dignity and not do research.

Now, there are obviously a sizeable number on the other side. And, obviously, the majority of the Senate is going to support H.R. 810. I respect people who differ with me. I am not going to call them names. I am not going to label them something that sounds un-American. What I will say is I disagree with them and will try to do so respectfully. I will try to do so from the basis of someone who is a very strong supporter of stem cell research. In fact, I would put my record up against just about anybody in the Senate with respect to appropriating, asking for, and getting appropriated dollars designated to do stem cell research.

I have been working for 6 years, particularly with the Pittsburgh Tissue Engineering Institute and a whole host of companies that have developed in and around the biotech quarter in Pittsburgh that have shown great promise. Some of the research you have heard about with respect to alternatives to embryonic stem cell research with these pluripotent cells—many of these companies, many of these alternatives have come out of Pittsburgh, come out of the work that has advanced as a result of some of the Federal help that we have given to the McGowan Institute and to the Pittsburgh Tissue Engineering Institute.

In fact, we have put together such a robust program with respect to tissue engineering and regenerative medicine using stem cells that we have partnered with the Army. President Bush, earlier this year, went down to Fort Sam Houston, TX, to look at some of the work that is being done with our soldiers who have been wounded and being able to regenerate skin or parts of bodies. In fact, there is one study underway right now to regenerate an ear, actually grow back an ear of someone who lost their ear in the Iraq war.