administration should continue our policy of engaging Kazakhstan to ensure that this key country moves towards the Western orbit and adopts continued market and political reforms.

From its independence from the Soviet Union in 1991 to the Present, Kazak leaders have made the difficult and controversial decisions necessary to bring their country into the 21st century. In May 1992, President Nursultan Nazarbayev announced that Kazakhstan would unilaterally disarm all of its nuclear weapons. In the aftermath of the Soviet Union's collapse, Kazakhstan was left with the fourth-largest nuclear arsenal in the world, a tempting target for terrorists and other extremists. Mr. Nazarbayev's courageous decision to disarm in the face of opposition from Islamic nationalists and potential regional instability was one of the fundamental building blocks that have allowed Kazakhstan to emerge as a strong, stable nation and a leader in Central Asia. Then-President George Bush hailed the decision as ''a momentous stride toward peace and stability.''

Since that time, Central Asia has become an increasingly complex region. Russia is reemerging from its post-Soviet economic crises and is actively looking for both economic opportunities in Central Asia as well as to secure its political influence over the region. China is rapidly expanding its economic power and political influence in the region. Iran, despite recent progress made by moderate elements in the government, is still a state sponsor of terrorism and is actively working to develop weapons of mass destruction. Many of the other former Soviet republics have become havens for religious extremists, terrorists, drug cartels and transit points for smugglers of all kind.

In the center of this conflict and instability Kasakhstan has begun to prosper by working to build a modern economy, developing its vast natural resources and providing a base of stability in a very uncertain part of the world. With the discovery of the massive Kashagan oil field in the Kazak portion of the Caspian Sea, Kazakhstan is poised to become a major supplier of petroleum to the Western World and a competitor to Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC). It is critical that we continue to facilitate western companies' investment in Kazakhstan and the establishment of secure, east-west pipeline routes for Kazak oil. This is the only way for Kazakhstan to loosen its dependence on Russia for transit rights for its oil and gas and secure additional, much needed, oil for the world market.

American policy in the region must be based on the complex geopolitics of Central Asia and provide the support required to enable these countries to reach their economic potential. We must continue to give top priority to the development of Kazakhstan's oil and gas industries and to the establishment of east-west transportation corridors for Caspian oil and gas. We must also remain committed to real support for local political leadership, fostering rule of law and economic reforms and to helping mitigate and solve the lingering ethnic and nationalistic conflicts in the region. Only through meaningful and substantial cooperation with Kazakhstan, will we be able to realize these goals.

There are many challenges ahead for Kazakhstan, but there are enormous opportunities for economic and political progress. Mr. Nazarbayev has taken advantage of Kazakhstan's stability to begin transforming its economy from the old Soviet form giant, state-owned industries and collective grain farms into a modern, market-based economy. We have much at stake in this development. Will Kazakhstan become a true market-oriented democracy, or will it slip into economic stagnation and ethnic violence like so many of its neighbor? The stability of Central Asia and the Caucasus depends on how Kazakhstan chooses to move forward. The United States must do its part to enhance U.S.-Kazakhstancooperation and encourage prosperity and stability for the entire region.

REMOVAL OF SIGNATURE FROM DISCHARGE PETITION

HON. DENNIS MOORE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 2001

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to request that my signature be removed from discharge petition number 0002. This petition moves to discharge the Committee on Rules from the consideration of H. Res. 165, a resolution providing for the consideration of the bill H.R. 1468.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (FERC) recent action to expand price restrictions imposed in California on wholesale electricity to cover 10 other Western states. Though FERC could have exercised its statutory authority to set ''just and reasonable'' wholesale rates several months ago, I hope that the Commission's June 19 Order will soon achieve the intended goal of ''correct[ing] dysfunctions in the wholesale power markets operated by the Independent System Operator [ISO] and California Power Exchange [PX].''

In response to FERC's June 19 Order, Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN [D–CA] and GORDON SMITH [R–OR] stopped advocating consideration of their legislation [S. 764] that would force FERC to follow its statutory mandate to set ''just and reasonable'' wholesale power rates. I agree with Senator SMITH that FERC's action renders S. 764 ''substantially moot.''

In light of FERC's recent actions and the decision by Senators FEINSTEIN and SMITH not to push for consideration of their legislation, I believe that House action on this matter is no longer warranted at this time. The House needs to exercise patience and wait for a period of perhaps a few months to see if FERC's June 19 Order exerts downward pressure on wholesale prices.

INTRODUCTION OF THE VACCINES FOR CHILDREN LEGISLATION

HON. JANE HARMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 2001

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be joined by many of my colleagues in introducing legislation today to improve children's access to immunization. Our bill will correct a technicality that now denies children enrolled in some State Children's Health Insurance Programs (SCHIP) free vaccines through the Vaccines for Children Program.

Today is a fitting day to introduce this bill because it is the first day of ''National Immunization Awareness Month.'' Immunization is the first stage in a lifetime of good health. Diseases such as polio, measles, and whooping cough have been virtually eradicated in the United States through widespread immunization. But access to needed vaccines can be severely constrained by the cost of $600 per child for the recommended schedule of immunizations. Federal programs such as Vaccines for Children were created to help ease the financial burden of vaccinations on poor families—we need to make sure that these vaccines continue to go to those who need them most.

The Vaccines for Children and the SCHIP were both designed to improve the health of children—we must now guarantee that they work well together. Because of a ruling by the Department of Health and Human Services in 1998, in states that chose to offer children insurance through non-Medicaid programs, children enrolled in SCHIP lost their eligibility for free vaccines. In California, this affected almost 580,000 children, and it costs the state $18 million a year to fill the gap left by the lack of coordination between these two programs. Children in 32 other states are similarly affected.

Our legislation would add children enrolled in State Children's Health Insurance Programs to the list of children eligible for Vaccines for Children, regardless of the way SCHIP is delivered in their state. These children received free vaccines when they were uninsured, and would receive vaccines were they enrolled in a Medicaid SCHIP program in another state. We must now fill the promise of better health care that came with the passage of SCHIP in 1997, and include these children in Vaccines for Children as well.

HUMAN CLONING PROHIBITION ACT OF 2001

SPEECH OF

HON. PETE SESSIONS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 2001

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit the article entitled, ''Cloning's Big Test'' for the RECORD.

[From the New Republic, Aug. 6, 2001]

CLONING'S BIG TEST

(By Leon R. Kass and Daniel Callahan)

Everyone has been arguing for weeks about whether President Bush should authorize funding for research on human embryonic stem cells. But few have noticed the much more momentous decision now before us: whether to permit the cloning of human beings. At issue in the first debate is the morality of using and destroying human embryos. At issue in the second is the morality of designing human children.

The day of human cloning is near. Reputable physicians have announced plans to produce a cloned child within the year. One biotech company (Advanced Cell Technology) just announced its intention to start producing embryonic human clones for research purposes. Recognizing the urgent need for action, Congress is considering legislation that would ban human cloning. Last Tuesday the House Judiciary Committee approved a tough anti-cloning bill, H.R. 2505, the Human Cloning prohibition Act of 2001. Introduced by Republican Dave Weldon of Florida and Democrat Bart Stupak of Michigan, and co-sponsored by more than 120

members from both parties, the bill is scheduled for a vote on the House floor as early as this week. But the House is also considering a much weaker ''compromise'' bill that would ban reproductive cloning but permit cloning for research. It is terribly important that the former, and not the latter, passes. First, because cloning is unethical, both in itself and in what it surely leads to. Second, because the Weldon-Stupak bill offers our best-indeed, our only—hope of preventing it from happening.

The vast majority of Americans object to human cloning. And they object on multiple grounds: It constitutes unethical experimentation on the child-to-be, subjecting him or her to enormous risks of bodily and developmental abnormalities. It threatens individuality, deliberately saddling the clone with a genotype that has already lived and to whose previous life its life will always be compared. It confuses identity by denying the clone two biological parents and by making it both twin and offspring of its older copy. Cloning also represents a giant step toward turning procreation into manufacture; it is the harbinger of much grizzlier eugenic manipulations to come. Permitting human cloning means condoning a despotic principle: that we are entitled to design the genetic makeup of our children (see ''Preventing a Brave New World,'' by Leon R. Kass, TNR, May 21).

So how do we stop it? The biotech industry proposes banning only so-called reproductive cloning by prohibiting the transfer of a cloned embryo to a woman to initiate a pregnancy. But this approach will fail. The only way to effectively ban reproductive cloning is to stop the process from the beginning, at the stage where the human somatic cell nucleus is introduced into the egg to produce the embryo clone. That is, to effectively ban any cloning, we need to ban all human cloning.

Here is why: Once cloned embryos exist, it will be virtually impossible to control what is done with them. Created in commercial laboratories, hidden from public view, stockpiles of cloned human embryos could be produced, bought, and sold without anyone knowing it. As we have seen with in vitro embryos created to treat infertility, embryos produced for one reason can be used for another: Today, ''spare embryos'' created to begin a pregnancy are used—by someone else—in research; and tomorrow, clones created for research will be used—by someone else—to begin a pregnancy. Efforts at clonal baby-making (like all assisted reproduction) would take place within the privacy of a doctor-patient relationship, making outside scrutiny extremely difficult.

Worst of all, a ban only on reproductive cloning will be unenforceable. Should the illegal practice be detected, governmental attempts to enforce the ban would run into a swarm of practical and legal challenges. Should an ''illicit clonal pregnancy'' be discovered, no government agency is going to compel a woman to abort the clone, and there would be understandable outrage were she fined or jailed before or after she gave birth. For all these reasons, the only practically effective and legally sound approach is to block human cloning at the start—at producing the embryonic clone.

The Weldon-Stupak bill does exactly that. It precisely and narrowly describes the specific deed that it outlaws (human somatic cell nuclear transfer to an egg). It requires no difficult determinations of the perpetrator's intent or knowledge. It introduces substantial criminal and monetary penalties, which will deter renegade doctors or scientists as well as clients who would bear cloned children. Carefully drafted and limited in scope, the bill makes very clear that there is to be no interference with the scientifically and medically useful practices of animal cloning or the equally valuable cloning of human DNA fragments, the duplication of somatic cells, or stem cells in tissue culture. And the bill steers clear of the current stem-cell debate, limiting neither research with embryonic stem cells derived from non-cloned embryos nor even the creation of research embryos by ordinary in vitro fertilization. If enacted, the law would bring the United States into line with many other nations.

Unfortunately, the House is also considering the biotech industry's favored alternative: H.R. 2608, introduced by Republican Jim Greenwood of Pennsylvania and Democrat Peter Deutsch of Florida. It explicitly permits the creation of cloned embryos for research while attempting to ban only reproductive cloning. But that's not something it is likely to achieve. It licenses companies to manufacture embryo clones, as long as they say they won't use them to initiate a pregnancy or ship them knowing that they will be so used. It therefore guarantees that there will be clonal embryo-farming and trafficking in clones, with many opportunities for reproductive efforts unintended by their original makers. And the bill's proposed ban on initiating pregnancy is, as already argued, virtually impossible to enforce.

There are further difficulties. The acts the Greenwood-Deutsch bill bans turn largely on intent and knowledge—hard matters to discern and verify. The confidentiality of the called-for Food and Drug Administration registration of embryos-cloning means that the public will remain in the dark about who is producing the embryo clones, where they are bought and sold, and who is doing what with them. A provision preempting state law would make it impossible for any state to enact any other—and more restrictive—legislation. A sunset clause dissolving the prohibition after ten years would leave us with no ban at all, not even on reproductive cloning. Most radically, the bill would create two highly disturbing innovations in federal law: It would license for the first time the creation of living human embryos solely for research purposes, and it would make it a felony not to ultimately exploit and destroy them. The Greenwood-Deutsch legislation reads less like the Cloning Prohibition Act of 2001 and more like the ''Human Embryo Cloning Registration and Industry Protection Act of 2001.''

It is possible that embryo-cloning will someday yield tissues derivable for each person from his own embryonic twin clone, tissues useful for the treatment of degenerative disease. But the misleading term ''therapeutic cloning'' obscures the fact that the research clone will be ''treated'' only to exploitation and destruction and that any future ''therapies'' are, at this point, purely hypothetical. Besides, we have promising alternatives—not only in adult stem cells but also in non-cloned embryonic stem-cell lines—that do not open the door to human clonal reproduction. Happily, these alternatives will not require commodifying women's ovaries in order to provide the vast number of eggs that would be needed to give each of us our own twin embryo when we need regenerative tissue. Should these alternatives fail, or should animal-cloning experiments someday demonstrate the unique therapeutic potential of stem cells derived from embryo clones, Congress could later revisit and lift the ban.

The Weldon-Stupak bill has drawn wide support across the political spectrum; feminist health writer Judy Norsigian and liberal embryologist Stuart Newman joined Catholic spokesman Richard Doerflinger and political theorist Francis Fukuyama in testifying in its favor. Health and Human Services Secretary Tommy Thompson, a proponent of research with embryonic stem cells, has endorsed it. Thoughtful people understand that human cloning is not about pro-life versus pro-choice. Neither is it a matter of right versus left. It is only and emphatically about baby design and manufacture, the opening skirmish of a long battle against eugenics and the post-human future. Once embryonic clones are produced in laboratories, the eugenic revolution will have begun. Our best chance to stop it may be on the House floor next week.

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCEIS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

SPEECH OF

HON. EVA M. CLAYTON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 2001

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the the Union had under consideration the bill. (H.R. 2620) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development and for sundry independent agenceis, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes,

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues an imporant issue affecting communities across the country, especially low-income communities with limited resources. Current Federal programs provide cleanup money for the worst sites. The Federal Government should help States provide funds for sites that have significant contaimination but aren't the worst. Federal funding for redevelopment goes mainly to urban areas because private sector participation is more readily available. Rural and Environmental Justice communities have non-commercial needs. Environmental justice programs do not provide funding for cleanup.

Superfund was established to address the worst sites. Sites that don't qualify for the National Priorities List may still require cleanup. Typically the State provides 10 percent of the cleanup cost and the Federal Government provides 90 percent of the cleanup cost.

All costs were recovered for the original Superfund site, the PCB spill along the roadsides of North Carolina that resulted in the Warren County problem.

EPA's Brownfields Program Provides money for site assessments and revolving loan programs. It does not provide money for actual cleanup. Economic redelevopment is key component. Most are located in urban areas.

Environmental Justice Programs provide funds to address EJ concerns and issues and to increase involvement by the people in areas where environment injusice has occured. It does not provide funds for cleanup activities.

Areas where environmental justice has occurred are typically low-inccome areas where it is difficult to obtain the private sector interest in economic redevelopment.

EJ communities have many needs other than economic redevlopment.

Warren County is one of the poorest counties in North Carolina. The site of the detoxification and redevelopment project is rural and