

1997 at 2:34 p.m. and said to contain a message from the President whereby he transmits proposed legislation entitled the "Cloning Prohibition Act of 1997."

With warm regards,

ROBIN H. CARLE,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

CLONING PROHIBITION ACT OF
1997—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESI-
DENT OF THE UNITED STATES
(H. DOC. NO. 105-97)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit today for immediate consideration and prompt enactment the "Cloning Prohibition Act of 1997." This legislative proposal would prohibit any attempt to create a human being using somatic cell nuclear transfer technology, the method that was used to create Dolly the sheep. This proposal will also provide for further review of the ethical and scientific issues associated with the use of somatic cell nuclear transfer in human beings.

Following the February report that a sheep had been successfully cloned using a new technique, I requested my National Bioethics Advisory Commission to examine the ethical and legal implications of applying the same cloning technology to human beings. The Commission concluded that at this time "it is morally unacceptable for anyone in the public or private sector, whether in a research or clinical setting, to attempt to create a child using somatic cell nuclear transfer cloning" and recommended that Federal legislation be enacted to prohibit such activities. I agree with the Commission's conclusion and am transmitting this legislative proposal to implement its recommendation.

Various forms of cloning technology have been used for decades resulting in important biomedical and agricultural advances. Genes, cells, tissues, and even whole plants and animals have been cloned to develop new therapies for treating such disorders as cancer, diabetes, and cystic fibrosis. Cloning technology also holds promise for producing replacement skin, cartilage, or bone tissue for burn or accident victims, and nerve tissue to treat spinal cord injury. Therefore, nothing in the "Cloning Prohibition Act of 1997" restricts activities in other areas of biomedical and agricultural research that involve: (1) the use of somatic cell nuclear transfer or other cloning technologies to clone molecules, DNA, cells, and tissues; or (2) the use of somatic cell nuclear transfer techniques to create animals.

The Commission recommended that such legislation provide for further re-

view of the state or somatic cell nuclear transfer technology and the ethical and social issues attendant to its potential use to create human beings. My legislative proposal would implement this recommendation and assign responsibility for the review, to be completed in the fifth year after passage of the legislation, to the National Bioethics Advisory Commission.

I urge the Congress to give this legislation prompt and favorable consideration.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, June 9, 1997.

□ 2000

NO WAY TO RUN A CONGRESS

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it has now been 83 days since the President first asked this Congress for disaster relief legislation. Flood-stricken families in the Midwest are desperately waiting for these funds. Yet the majority has loaded up this bill with provisions the President has said that he cannot accept in an effort to embarrass him.

Let me quote from today's Wall Street Journal that says Speaker NEWT GINGRICH has privately indicated that he never expected the President to sign the bill sent to him. Let me also mention what Republicans are privately conceding, that this is more of a rhetorical attempt to embarrass Mr. Clinton, put themselves in a better light after helping to provoke shutdowns in the last Congress.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about people's lives. There are literally tens of thousands of people unable to make basic decisions about their lives until this bill is enacted. Yet the majority refuses to send a bill without these provisions to the President. This simply is no way to run a Congress.

Mr. Speaker, providing Federal assistance to the victims in times of crisis is one of the fundamental roles of the United States Congress, yet my Republican colleagues would abdicate this basic responsibility in order to score political points.

I implore the majority to stop playing politics with people's lives. Send the President a clean disaster bill today.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. GEPHARDT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. DREIER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BONIOR addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

WE SHOULD NOT SACRIFICE FREE-
DOM OF EXPRESSION WITH A
FLAG AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PAUL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, in 2 days we are going to be debating an amendment to the Constitution dealing with the flag. The proposed flag amendment to the Constitution deals with more than just the issue of freedom of speech. It involves the right of free expression and the right to own property. These two are inseparable. A free society cannot have one without the other; and when one is compromised, so is the other.

When property rights are correctly honored, free expression is guaranteed through that right. The independence of a newspaper, radio station or a church guarantees the use of that property in any free expression desired. No one has the right to use any newspaper, radio or church to exert his or her own opinion as an example of free speech. Catholics have no right to say Mass in a Jewish temple. Certainly in our homes we are protected from others imposing their free speech on us. It is the church property that guarantees freedom of religion. The networks or papers need not submit to demands to be heard by religious believers as an example of free speech. Use of the radio or newspaper by those with strong opinions or religious views is only done voluntarily with the permission of the owner.

Yes, it is very important who owns the flag and where it was desecrated. What if it is in a home or in a church for some weird reason? Do the police invade the premises? Who gets sent in? The BATF, the DEA, the FBI, the U.S. Army or the U.S. flag police? If it is on government property or a government flag or someone else's flag, that is an attack on property that can and should be prosecuted. By legislating against how someone else's flag is being used, the right of free expression and property ownership is infringed just as if it were church property or a newspaper.

We work diligently to protect controversial expression in books, television and movies and even bizarre religious activities through the concept of

private property ownership as long as violence is not used. Is this matter any different?

We live in an age where it is becoming more common to attack free expression, and that is a danger we should not ignore. We find one political group attacking expression that violates the subjective rules of politically correctness while working to prohibit voluntary prayer. Now another wants to curtail expression through flag anti-desecration laws in the name of patriotism. But there is a better way to handle demonstrations and malcontents.

The danger here is that flag burners frequently express a disdain for big government. Curtailing any expression of criticism of the government is fraught with great danger. Will anyone who opposed big government someday be identified as a friend of the flag burners and treated like one since he is expressing an idea similar to the flag burners? Just because some people are not smart enough to express themselves in any other way than flag burning, it does not justify the careless attack on free expression. Once it is routinely accepted expressing these ideas as dangerous to the status quo, all our freedoms are threatened.

We need to direct our patriotic zeal toward defending the Constitution and to the protection of liberty. Lack of this effort has led to the impending bankruptcy of the warfare state. Now, there is a problem worth directing our attention.

The flag police are no substitute for our policing our own activities and responsibilities here in the Congress. We are endlessly delivering more power in the name of political emergencies, budgetary crises and government efficiency to the Executive, a process not permitted under the Constitution. We permit socialists to attack property rights and the fundamentals of economic liberty as a right under our Constitution. But those who profess respect for private property should not be trapped into attacking flag property when it is used to express unpopular antigovernment views and even change the Bill of Rights to do so.

The socialists know what they are doing, but the anti-desecrators act out of confused emotions while responding to political pressures. We should not further sacrifice freedom of expression with a flag amendment. Especially when compared to the harm done with taxpayers' funding of school programs and NEA desecration, it is negligible. True patriots can surely match the wits of the jerks who burn flags without undermining the first and the fifth amendments.

Mr. Speaker, we can do better than rush to alter constitutionally protected free expression for a nonproblem. We could easily organize bigger and grander demonstrations to celebrate our constitutional liberties for which the flag is our symbol in answer to the flag burners.

I promise to appear any time, any place to celebrate our liberties and countermand the flag burners who work so hard to offend us. We do not need an amendment to the Constitution which for the first time in our history would undermine and curtail the protections of the first amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

TRIBUTE TO NEW JERSEY'S 13TH ANNUAL DEAF AND HARD OF HEARING DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAPPAS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, as I stand here today, almost three-quarters of a million of my fellow New Jersey citizens are unable to hear what I am saying. It is not that they are not listening, but rather they are physically unable to hear. Although closed captioning television is beneficial to some, many citizens are without the service.

I rise today to recognize my State's proclamation of June 14 as the 13th Annual Deaf and Hard of Hearing Day. This day sets out to raise awareness for an issue and a segment of our population that face a silent disability.

The ability to hear is truly a blessing and something that those of us who can hear often take for granted. For just a moment think of all the different sounds that echo through our daily lives: The birds chirping in the early morning, the music in the car, or the elevator, or familiar voices of our friends, family members, and coworkers.

As a society we depend on sounds in so many ways: Vehicle horns when we are driving, fire alarms to alert us to danger, and even here in Congress we listen for the bells to alert us of upcoming votes.

It is difficult to imagine the everyday difficulties that those citizens who are unable to hear face in their efforts to function in a society that uses sounds in so many ways as a means of communication.

Beyond the sounds we hear, the spoken language is our primary means of expressing and receiving our thoughts and ideas. We use telephones to communicate, we listen to the television and radio for our entertainment and information, but the deaf community and hard of hearing community communicates in a much different way. The silent disability that they face forces them to converse through sign language and use TDD and relay services as an alternative method of telephone communication.

As a student of sign language myself, I am well aware of the daily efforts

that must be made to express themselves without spoken words. Yet it is a difficult language to learn but highly necessary for survival. I encourage everyone who has the opportunity to learn, to learn sign language.

This Saturday at the Great Adventure Amusement Park in Jackson, NJ, thousands of people from New Jersey's deaf and hard of hearing community will celebrate the 13th Annual Deaf and Hard of Hearing Day. If anyone is interested in seeking out more information on the day's events, they can call either through Voice or TDD, and the telephone number at the Division of the Deaf and Hard of Hearing in New Jersey is 609-984-7281.

I want to congratulate Richard Her-ring, the Director of the Division of the Deaf and Hard of Hearing of the New Jersey Department of Human Services, for his efforts in making this annual event such a success. His efforts over the years to celebrate, educate, raise awareness, and recognize the achievements made by fellow citizens have truly had a tremendous impact on both the deaf and hearing communities of my State.

BAD MANAGEMENT OF AN EMERGENCY BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, today the President, President Clinton, vetoed a bill which he had said very clearly that he was going to veto. Very clearly he had indicated that that veto was coming because of a series of extraneous riders to an otherwise emergency bill. And so we have a situation that I have really in 30 years of legislative life that I have gone through both in Massachusetts, my home State, and here 6 years in the Congress, I think that I have never seen an emergency bill managed more cavalierly, more carelessly by the legislative body and the majority than this one has been managed this year.

It was back in March, the 19th of March, that the President had asked for this legislation totaling about \$7.1 billion, part of it to deal with the very serious natural disasters in the Ohio Valley, the flooding in northern California, the Red River Valley, and the Dakotas, and in Minnesota in order to help put back the lives of hundreds of thousands of devastated families, farms and businesses, people whose lives had really been deeply hurt by that and also, by the way, to carry out \$1.8 billion that was to provide our peacekeepers in Bosnia, those people, men and women, who wear the American uniform and are doing a dirty and a tough job, but a necessary job, the resources that they need in order to do that.

□ 2015

There is no reason whatsoever why this bill should not have been passed