

exploitation. He helped expand the powers of law enforcement authorities through the Missing Children Act of 1982, as well as working toward the creation of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children.

Four years ago I came to Congress with what I thought was a very full agenda. However, in April of 1997, a 13-year-old constituent of mine was abducted and murdered, and my mission in Congress changed. I, along with the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CRAMER) and former Congressman Bob Franks from New Jersey founded the Congressional Missing and Exploited Children's Caucus.

□ 1430

The purpose of this caucus is three-fold. One, to build awareness around the issue of missing and exploited children for the purpose of finding children who are currently missing and to prevent future abductions.

Two, to create a voice within Congress on the issue of missing and exploited children and to introduce legislation that would strengthen law enforcement, community organizing and school-based efforts to address child abduction.

Three, to identify ways to work effectively in our districts to address child abduction. By developing cooperative efforts that involve police departments, educators and community groups, we can heighten awareness of the issue and pool resources for the purpose of solving outstanding cases and preventing future abductions, hold briefings with the National Center For Missing and Exploited Children and other child advocacy organizations.

Those are worthy goals. As a society, our efforts to prevent crimes against children have not kept pace with the increasing vulnerability of our young citizens. So I ask my colleagues to please contact my office if you are interested in joining this very important caucus. I ask the citizens of the United States of America to be aware of this dire problem that we face with our children in every community throughout our country. Our children, our grandchildren, our nieces, our nephews are counting on you to give them a voice in Washington, D.C.

STATEMENT AGAINST FEDERAL FUNDING OF EMBRYONIC STEM CELL RESEARCH

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, today I want to talk about a very serious issue that is currently under review by the Bush administration. Included in his decision process is a question, should the Federal Government fund human embryonic stem cell research.

This is clearly a very emotional issue with strong views on both sides. View-

points from groups as disparate as patient advocates and religious groups have weighed in. This is virtually a tug of war with neither side willing to concede.

As a strong supporter of biomedical research at the National Institutes of Health, I unquestionably recognized the call for the onward march towards understanding treatments and cures for many debilitating conditions that have been plaguing mankind for as long as we can remember. However, I also can see the morally troubling question behind embryonic stem cell research. Is it justifiable to purposefully end one life even if it results in the salvation of millions of others?

While religious viewpoints can certainly play a role in this debate, let us put that aside for the moment and approach this subject from a purely historical scientific perspective. Throughout history, scientific research has produced substantial social benefits. It has also posed some disturbing ethical questions. Indeed, public attention was first drawn to questions about reported abuses of human subjects in horrifying biomedical experiments during World War II.

During the Nuremberg War Crime Trials, the Nuremberg Code was drafted as a set of standards for judging physicians and scientists who had conducted biomedical experiments on concentration camp prisoners.

This code became the prototype of many later codes with the intention of assuring that research involving human subjects would be carried out in an ethical manner. It became a foundation of much international and United States law surrounding clinical research. Since 1975, embryos in the woman at this stage, at this same stage of development, about a week old, have been seen by the Federal Government as "human subjects" to be protected from harmful research.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and the American people should realize since an embryo is a human subject, embryonic stem cell research without a doubt violates many of the tenets of the Nuremberg Code and U.S. law.

First, it says, "The voluntary consent of the human subject is absolutely essential." Of course, the embryo from whom a well-meaning scientist would extract cells would have no capacity to give its consent and exercise its free choice. Further, the code states that any experiments should yield results that are "unprocurable by other methods or means of study." Because stem cells can be obtained from other tissues and fluids of adult subjects without harm, it is unnecessary to perform cell extraction from embryos that will result in their death.

Even the Clinton National Bioethics Advisory Commission said that embryo destructive research should go forward only "if no less morally problematic alternatives are available for the research." They did not say to go forward

with embryonic and adult stem cell research so we can see what works better. They did not say the alternatives had to work better than embryo destructive research. The only criteria that they gave is if there was a less morally problematic alternative to embryo destroying research, then using embryos would not be justifiable.

This is from the National Bioethics Advisory Commission, September 1999, this quote, "In our judgment, the derivation of stem cells from embryos remaining following infertility treatments is justifiable only if no less morally problematic alternatives are available for advancing the research . . . The claim that there are alternatives to using stem cells derived from embryos is not, at the present time, supported scientifically." There is an ethical alternative, and Federal money should not be spent on destroying human embryos.

Finally the code insists that "no experiment should be conducted where there is an a priori reason to believe that death or disabling injury will occur . . . even remote possibilities of injury, disability, or death." Without a doubt the embryo, of course, dies.

These are but a few doctrines of the Nuremberg Code which I ask you to consider while the Nation and the President grapples with this very serious decision.

Embryonic stem cell research treats an embryo as a clump of tissue with less protection than a laboratory rat. There are promising alternative sources of stem cells with which to perform promising medical research. We must not allow Federal dollars to fund this destructive and needless practice.

SUPPORT FOR THE DECISION TO REJECT UNITED-US AIRWAYS MERGER

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, an hour or so ago the U.S. Department of Justice announced that they will file suit to block the proposed merger of United Airlines and U.S. Airways. That announcement is the best news in U.S. aviation since deregulation.

The decision by the Justice Department to oppose the merger of United and U.S. Airways will keep airline competition alive. It will spare the flying public the increased costs, reduced competition, and deteriorating service that would have resulted from this merger, which in turn would have precipitated the consolidation of all of the remainder of domestic air service into three globe straddling mega carriers.

The Department of Justice and the Department of Transportation must now continue their vigilance to maintain strong and healthy competition in aviation and prohibiting barriers to competition that result from mergers, from biased reservation systems, and

from predatory pricing practices. I congratulate the Justice Department for completing a thorough painstaking analysis of this proposed merger, reviewing its effects on hub-to-hub non-stop service in currently competitive markets, on the down-stream effect on remaining mergers, as well as the consequences for international competition.

ISOLATIONISM OF UNITED STATES

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to speak about something that really bothers me. This country has a constant debate within its political body about what role we in the United States will play with respect to the rest of the world.

The battle between being an internationalist and being an isolationist is something that has gone on in this country, back and forth. Our decisions in the 1920s in this body to pass the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act was a way of erecting barriers around the United States and ultimately led to the depression in 1929.

Those of us who consider themselves to be both free and fair traders have had great hope in our decision nationally to deal in trade with the whole world as a way of preventing countries from getting into wars. If one is trading with somebody it is much less likely that one is going to involve oneself in some kind of destructive war that will destroy one's own resources as well as those of the country with which one is dealing.

Beginning with the installation of the President by the Supreme Court of the United States, a new isolationism has begun to set in in this country and most people are not paying much attention to it or they are not putting it together and seeing the whole picture.

This isolationism is not one of economics but one of which the United States is isolating itself from the rest of the world in terms of public opinion about the problems which face the entire globe. And our country willy-nilly goes along deciding we are going to do it our own way. Never mind anybody else. We will do it our own way.

Now, in 1972 they created a convention to prevent the spread of biological warfare, 1972. It has been there for 30 years. But this administration went to the U.N. and said we refuse to be involved in finding any way to enforce that convention.

It is the same government that says that we are going to bomb the living daylight out of and sanction Iraq because they are creating biological weapons. If you refuse yourself to be allowed to be inspected on that issue, how can you stand and take a public position in that world and say, but they cannot do it and we are going to

isolate them until we stop them. It is simply the United States saying we are bigger than they are, we can do whatever we want.

Recently within the last week or so, the Japanese and the European Union decided they were going to try and save the globe from global warming. They came to an agreement, a sort of Kyoto II if you will, because the United States walked away and said we will not be a part of this. We are not going to do anything. We will not worry about global warming. We will continue to do what we have always done.

We are 5 percent of the world's population using 25 percent of the energy in the world and producing the largest portion of the global-damaging chemicals in our air. But the rest of the world has said, well, okay, if the United States wants to sit over there on the sidelines we will try to save it without them. We isolated ourselves.

The President does not believe in the anti-ballistic missile treaty. He said we have to begin putting up a missile shield because we are really afraid of Korea and we are afraid of Iraq and we are afraid of these rogue countries. We are going to spend 50, \$70 billion trying to prevent one missile if it ever should come from one of these countries and, in the process, tear up the treaty that said we are not going to have more missiles.

I do not think the problem is going to come from Korea or some other rogue country, North Korea. The problems are the old Soviet Union and Russia and the Chinese and some of these countries. It is much better to have an anti-ballistic missile treaty in place that is gradually bringing the number of missiles down.

To say we are going to prepare for the fact that there is going to be an escalation is simply to set it in motion. The minute we put up a shield everybody is going to say we have to arm because the Americans have a shield up and they can zing us any time they want. We will set off back into the Cold War. It is like George Bush won, when the Cold War ended, and they did not know what to do so now they will create Cold War II. That is what is going on here.

The CTBT Treaty, the Confidential Test Ban Treaty, the United States will not sign that. Why should anyone else? People get all excited when the Indians do it or the Pakistanis do it. Why? The United States of America will not say we will stop. Where do we have the moral authority to tell anybody else? We have isolated ourselves into a position of moral authority, but we cloak it in a kind of funny way with we will tell all the rest of the world what to do but do not tell us anything. That is not going to work.

□ 1445

HUMAN CLONING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KIRK). Under the Speaker's announced

policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to try in the next hour to cover a host of issues that are being hotly debated today in this country. I mainly want to focus on the issue of human cloning.

Next week, the House of Representatives will take up a piece of legislation I authored with my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK), the Human Cloning Prohibition Act of 2001, H.R. 2505. This bill cleared the Committee on the Judiciary and is now scheduled to be taken up by the House on Tuesday.

I wanted to talk this afternoon about that bill, about a competing piece of legislation that has been introduced by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD), H.R. 2172, focus on some of the differences between these two bills in terms of the way they deal with this issue of human cloning. And then I would also like to just go over some of the basics of sexual reproduction versus cloning reproduction and as well some of the issues associated with the stem cell debate, because the issue of human cloning and the issue of stem cells do overlap somewhat.

This chart I have next to me here on my left highlights some of the differences between these two bills. I would just like to go over that briefly.

The legislation introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH) is H.R. 2172. I think theirs is also entitled the Human Cloning Prohibition Act. It allows the creation of human embryos through cloning technology to be used specifically for research and then for destruction. It allows research cloning, but I want to highlight there are no therapies that exist today in humans, nor is there an animal model. I say this because this form of cloning is referred to as therapeutic cloning. While it may be true that someday it may be possible to do this type of cloning they are talking about and use it for a therapeutic intervention in a patient, there are no known therapies today available for human cloning.

What their bill essentially is is a moratorium on implantation. I will get into that in a little bit more detail. Implantation is when the embryo actually seats itself in the womb and begins the process of further differentiating into a fetus. I say that their bill is a moratorium because they have a 10-year sunset on their bill. Their bill goes away, would have to be reauthorized in 10 years, and so I think it could legitimately be called a moratorium and not a real ban on so-called reproductive cloning.

I just want to highlight that all creation of cloned embryos is reproductive cloning. To say that their bill is a reproductive cloning ban I believe it is