The biggest difference between the plans are, first and foremost, we want to manage it through Medicare, not let the HMOs, as they have done through the other insurance plans. We do not want to put, as the HMOs have, profits ahead of people. We want to put people ahead of profits. We want to keep the costs down, contain the costs. We want to make it optional for you to participate, and affordable is the reason why you will choose through our plan to participate. And, finally, to protect the most vulnerable in our society, the most frail elderly of our society who built this country, who endured the Depression, came through the wars, the world wars, the most burdensome world wars that took its toll on their lives. Many of them are disabled, handicapped because of those wars, and the most prosperous, richest, wealthiest country on Earth cannot afford to help the most vulnerable of our society? I am here asking why not?

I thank the gentleman for the opportunity. I appreciate the leadership of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TURNER. I thank the gentleman for his passion on this issue and for his leadership. I know we all feel strongly about this. I cannot help but think of the constituents that you mentioned and the constituents that I visit with all the time who are struggling to pay their prescription drug costs. I just ran into one just the other day, it was at the Quik Lube in Lufkin, angry that the Congress had not acted to pass a meaningful drug plan. I have seen those seniors board those buses in Houston to travel to Mexico and come back and say they have saved $10,000 by making the trip together.

I know the next gentleman who will speak understands that problem, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN), a fighter for seniors on the prescription drug issue who has also seen in his State those seniors board those buses and go to Canada and save thousands of dollars.

It is a pleasure to yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. ALLEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank the gentleman from Illinois, who has been such a terrific fighter for this issue since he came to the Congress.

I will be very brief. I just wanted to say, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PHELPS) was saying, he was trying to explain to people back home what the difference is between the Republican Party and the Democratic Party on this issue. I would add, in addition to what he said, that we Democrats do not believe we can fool all the people all of the time. For the second election cycle in a row, the Republican Party has put up a plan which is an illusion, will not provide prescription drug coverage to seniors because the private insurance market will not provide what they say it will provide. This plan will not become law. If it becomes law, it will not provide help to seniors because it relies on the private insurance market. There is no guaranteed benefit, no guaranteed copay. It is whatever the insurance companies want to charge.

The fundamental problem is that the people who will sign up for the plan are those who have very high prescription drug bills. The insurance industry will not be able to make money, and so they will stop providing the coverage. We have already been through this with managed care under Medicare. This kind of approach does not work.

Everyone else in this country who is employed and has prescription drug coverage gets their prescription drug coverage through their health care plan. For seniors, it is Medicare. All we are saying as Democrats is let us have a Medicare prescription drug benefit. Let us not try year after year, election after election, to cloud this issue, pretend we have a plan as the Republicans do and not do anything.

The aversion to strengthening Medicare from our friends on the other side of the aisle is so strong that they will never do it. They will never do it. Only a Medicare benefit, only strengthening Medicare, will provide the solution. That is what the Democratic plan is. That is what the Republican plan is not. That is why we need to pass the Democratic plan.

Mr. TURNER. I thank the gentleman again for his strong leadership. We both came to Congress together. We have both been fighting for this ever since we arrived here. On behalf of all of our constituents who continue to tell us they need help with the high cost of prescription drugs, they need a meaningful, a real prescription drug plan that is a part of Medicare, that they can afford, we will continue to fight.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4931, RETIREMENT SAVINGS SECURITY ACT OF 2002

Mr. DIAZ-BALART (during the Special Order of Mr. TURNER) from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107–522) on the resolution (H. Res. 451) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4931) to provide that the pension and individual retirement arrangement provisions of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 shall be permanent, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

HUMAN CLONING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I and several of my colleagues, including the distinguished physician and Congressman from Florida by the name of DAVID WELDON, wanted to rise in this Chamber to discuss an issue that, while it has fallen to some extent, to use a colloquialism, below the radar screen here in our Nation's Capital, it is without a doubt the most significant moral question that the institution of the Congress will contend with in this session of Congress and perhaps, Mr. Speaker, for many sessions of Congress to come.

As we debate the restructuring of agencies of the Federal Government, the new Department of Homeland Security, as we debate in memorable terms, as my colleagues just did, the extension of benefits under Medicare, all of these issues pale in comparison to the potential cultural impact and the impact on our system of legal ethics that the legalization of human cloning would represent to our society and even to our civilization.

Yet even though this body has acted and awaits action in the balance of the Congress, I believe it is incumbent upon the Members of this institution who cherish the dignity of human life to rise and to remind our colleagues, as I will do so in the moments ahead, and any of those that are looking in about the profound moral questions that we wrestle with when we argue in favor of a ban of human cloning.

It is my hope that as the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) joins us later, he will speak to the medical questions and myths that surround the promise of embryonic stem cell research. The gentleman from Florida will no doubt point out, as many of us did during the debates, that every single breakthrough in the area of stem cell research has taken place using adult stem cells, Mr. Speaker. Not a single breakthrough in medical science has ever occurred using embryonic stem cell research. Yet we are being sold a bill of goods by a technical medical industry that would have us move the line of thousands of years of medical ethics to permit what they, in almost Orwellian terms, refer to as therapeutic cloning, the cloning of human beings, of nascent human life, for the express purpose of testing that tissue.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to say we must prevent human life from becoming a wholesale commodity that is created and consumed. Let me say again, my theme today, my purpose for rising in this Chamber with the colleagues that will join me, is very simple. We must prevent in this Congress, before the close of this year, this session of Congress, we must prevent, by law, human life from becoming a commodity that is created and consumed in a marketplace of science.

I say that knowing that there will be those listening in in offices here on Capitol Hill, there will be those listening in around the United States, who think that this is something of a strange science fiction assertion. But let me suggest to you as a family man, as the father of three small children, a

husband of 17 years, let me say that it is precisely about that that I believe this debate over human cloning emanates.

□ 1700

I come to the floor this afternoon to speak about really the failure of the Congress to adopt a ban on human cloning. It is, Mr. Speaker, without a doubt, human cloning, perhaps the most anticipated and even feared development in the history of science. The promise that opening up this Pandora's box seems to hold for some pales in comparison to the backdrop of that great Biblical adage that reads in the book of Isaiah that, I am God, and there is no other. Human cloning is about the creation of human life for utilitarian ends. It is anticipated, and it is rightly feared.

For decades, truthfully, humans have been probing the darkest regions of their imagination to craft stories in science fiction where the duplication of human life is acceptable, but we always run in, it seems, to the old prophet, and he says, I am God, and there is no other.

Over the last several years, advances in the understanding of cellular biology have made it apparent that this brave new world described by science fiction writers was not actually that far off. We have since learned that cloning is, in fact, a possibility and could be, or may, Mr. Speaker, I say with hesitation, may already be, a reality.

Somewhere in the world today, somewhere in America today, while Congress fails to act on a ban of human cloning, amoral scientists may be in the process of duplicating human life and thereby, perhaps, laying the foundation for duplicating a human being, created always, up until that point, Mr. Speaker, in the image of God, the first human being in history created in the image of another human being.

Several of my colleagues tonight and I want to examine precisely these questions, these large moral and ethical questions, that seem to get left in the dust behind the promise of somatic cell nuclear transfer and embryonic stem cell research.

We hear about the promise. We see people rising out of wheelchairs, we see quadriplegics able to walk, and we want to reach for that, Mr. Speaker, but we, to do so, must reach across a line that mankind has never and should never cross.

Cloning involves the making of an exact genetic copy of a human being through a process called somatic cell nuclear transfer. In the process, the DNA is removed from the cell of a human, and it is transferred to an egg cell. The result is the formation of a human embryo, the beginning of human life. Theoretically, if this embryo were implanted in a womb, it would have the ability to follow the normal stages of development until a human being is born.

I say to you today that while most of us recognize the problems of using cloning for procreation and are prepared to outlaw the practice of it, Mr. Speaker, there are some who would have us talk about somatic cell nuclear transfer as though what was created was not human life, and there is great confusion on this point.

I say, not in an effort to crowd the upcoming remarks of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON), but I say, Mr. Speaker, with deep humility, that there are many in this debate who want to refer in cavalier ways to that embryonic tissue and say it is something other than human life. Mr. Speaker, if it is not nascent human life, what is it?

I was provoked to come to the floor of this Congress by the words of some of the advocates of so-called therapeutic cloning, who are now about the business of sharing a new slogan with America, and it is a slogan that in effect says a single cell can feel no pain. A single cell can feel no pain, as though the moral and ethical line would not be crossed in the absence of pain. It is an absurd anti-intellectual and antihistorical assertion, and I call it as such, regardless of who may use it.

Many in the scientific community, Mr. Speaker, believe that nascent embryonic life should be used for medical research through this procedure known as therapeutic cloning. They have come up with this innocuous term. It is very misleading. In this procedure the cloned embryo is created solely for the use of its parts. The human is given life, only to be destroyed a few days later for specialized stem cells.

I go back to the thesis of my remarks today. We must prevent human life from becoming a wholesale commodity that is created and consumed and destroyed, which is precisely what therapeutic cloning is, Mr. Speaker. It is the creation of embryonic human life to be destroyed for its parts.

Despite the fact that research on embryonic stem cells has yet to produce any treatment for any medical condition, as I said before, researchers are calling the cloning and harvesting of embryonic stem cells ''therapeutic.'' Humanity is contemplating the creation of a subclass of human life that is created and killed for the benefit of other humans.

Mr. Speaker, I come from south of Highway 40 in Indiana. I am not the brightest bulb in the box. But, for crying out loud, how can we suggest that this is anything other than the creation of a form of human life that we have never recognized before, the creation of a class of human life that exists to benefit other humans who are farther along in their physiological development?

I often say to my children, it is not sufficient to think once about hard issues, you have to think twice. Mr. Speaker, this is one of those issues where you have to think twice, and the moral and ethical issues raised even by experimental and so-called therapeutic cloning become obvious.

I fear we are turning life literally into a wholesale commodity to be created and destroyed. Make no mistake, if we proceed down this course, millions of human embryos, nascent human life, will be created and then destroyed, and even then we may not attain the scientific achievements that have been promised to us.

Now, some may be willing to say that, well, there will not be that much destruction of nascent human life, but, Mr. Speaker, less than 3 percent of cloned embryos in animal studies are successfully implanted to go to term. Birth defects occur in legion numbers. Literally, Dolly the Sheep was the product of thousands of failed aberrations in the attempt to clone a single mammal.

And to think of this kind of experimentation, as we go not just from the therapeutic cloning, the cellular level, stem cell research, but we know in our hearts there will be those media-hound scientists who will want to show up with the first cloned baby. Think of the children who will go before the first baby. Think of the birth defects. Think of the spontaneous abortions. If Dolly the Sheep is to be the instructor, if the experience of cloning experimentation on mammals teaches us anything, it teaches us that there will be a nightmare of destruction leading to that one fully cloned human being.

I do not know about the rest of my colleagues, but it is my firm conviction that scientific advancement is not worth the price of human embryo factories. It is also not worth the price of one innocent unborn human life that attempts to make it to term, but, because the scientific technology is not sufficiently advanced, it dies in utero or after delivery.

Human cloning must be stopped in every form. Unfortunately, those who support cloning are attempting, I would argue, in some cases to twist the facts to fit their agenda. Recent statements by supporters of cloning suggest that cloning actually is not cloning, that it is medical research on a cluster of cells stripped of their humanity. Mr. Speaker, I fear that this utilitarian logic has caused us to overlook deep ethical and moral implications involved in cloning.

But also I would say humbly, as I prepare to recognize my colleague and friend from Florida, that not only are they wrong on the ethics and the morality, but, Mr. Speaker, I say with real humility, they are wrong on the science. They are wrong on the medicine. They are wrong on the potential advances that this research affords.

As this Congress moves forward in this debate, it is absolutely essential that we do not let the weird science and the unsubstantiated promises dominate this debate, but that we look with the cold eye of science as we evaluate the promise here.

I would add, Mr. Speaker, it would be sufficient for this Congressman, even if the science held all the promise in the world, it would be sufficient for me to oppose human cloning, even cellular human cloning and research, on moral and ethical grounds. And yet, inasmuch as it is helpful to our argument, I have called upon my colleague and friend, the author of the House bill of banning human cloning, to join me in this Special Order today to talk about the science.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON), before he came to this institution, was an established physician with a background in microbiology. He is a man who speaks with unique authority on these issues in this institution. It was the reason why we were able to develop legislation here and develop strong bipartisan support behind a human cloning ban. Part of the argument that the gentleman from Florida made, and I trust will make again today, is that while certainly morality and medical ethics for thousands of years are on the side of banning human cloning in all its forms, for all of its purposes, happily, the science is on our side as well.

With that, I yield to the author of the ban on human cloning in the House, the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to thank him for the support and assistance provided me and all of the others involved in passing the ban on human cloning out of the House of Representatives. The gentleman's involvement was extremely helpful. I also want to thank the gentleman for making arrangements for this Special Order.

We continue to await action from the other body on this issue. As we all know, the bill to ban human cloning, which I had authored along with my colleague the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK), a Democrat, passed the House of Representatives now almost a year ago. It was July of 2001 that it passed. I just want to point out that that bill passed the House of Representatives by a 100-vote margin, I think it was 63 Democrats voting for it, and about 20 Republicans voting against it, so this is clearly not a Republican versus Democrat issue. It passed overwhelmingly, with a very, very clear bipartisan vote.

I just want to underscore that the bill as it passed the House does not ban stem cell research. There are a lot of people that confuse these issues. I will admit they are complicated.

□ 1715

I have a background in medicine and science, and it is easy for me to follow these things; but for lay people, it is very, very hard to sort out when are we talking about stem cell research and when we are talking about human cloning.

Also, the bill does not ban cloning tissues; it does not ban animal cloning. It specifically bans human cloning. And for the sake of discussion tonight, I do want to review exactly what that is. It is what is called asexual reproduction. I have a chart here to my left. The top row here shows the normal fertilization where the sperm unites with the egg, it forms a single cell, a fertilized egg, or single cell embryo; and this next picture here shows a 3-day-old embryo and then a 5- to 7-day-old embryo.

In human beings, humans have 46 chromosomes, 23 are resident in the sperm, 23 are resident in the nucleus of the egg. They come together, 23 plus 23 equals 46, creating a new human being. This is how we all begin our path through eternity here on Earth and beyond, as a uniting of 23 chromosomes from the sperm and the egg.

In cloning, what is done is we take the egg and we either inactivate the nucleus with 23 chromosomes in it or, as shown in this particular diagram, we have removed it, so we create an egg that has no nucleus in it, no genetic material, no chromosomes. Then we take a donor cell, and in this diagram it is depicted like the skin cell, and we take the nucleus out of it. We call these somatic cells, and that is where the term ''somatic cell nuclear transfer'' comes from. The cells in our body, the skin cells, the cells in our heart, in our muscles, we call them somatic cells. Somatic means body.

The process involves taking the nucleus out of that and putting the nucleus into the egg. When that is done, that is called somatic cell nuclear transfer. If the process works, 3 days later we have an embryo that is essentially indistinguishable from this embryo here, except this embryo here is a unique individual created by the combination of the chromosomes here. This embryo is actually the identical twin of the person who donated this cell. So if I were to donate my cell and somebody were to go through this procedure, this embryo developing would be my twin brother, my identical twin brother. That is why we call it cloning.

This is the exact procedure that was used to create Dolly the sheep. What they did in that particular instance is they took an egg from one sheep, they deactivated the nucleus, they took an udder cell, which is essentially a breast duct cell, and extracted the nucleus from that, and they created a new sheep which was a clone of this one. And then once it grows in culture, we have to put it inside the womb of a surrogate mother and, ultimately, Dolly the sheep was to be produced.

The reason I am going through all of this in exquisite detail is some people are trying to say this is not really cloning, that you are not really creating a human if you do this; and in humans they like to call it things like ''nuclear transfer.'' When we start playing language games like that, we are essentially trying to tell us all that Dolly is not a sheep. I mean if we do this with a person, we will get a person. It will start out like we all do as a baby and then grow up to become an adolescent.

Now, what are some of the problems with this? Well, the number of problems are huge. They are absolutely gigantic. It took 270 tries to create Dolly the sheep. Many lambs were born with very, very severe birth defects. Many of the offspring amongst the five species that have been cloned so far emerged very, very large, very large placentas and umbilical chords. A woman might look 9 months pregnant when she is only 4½ months along. Also, very defective fetuses. Indeed, there was one research study that showed that all offspring from the procedure of cloning so far have genetic abnormalities. So this is human experimentation, and it is human experimentation of the absolute worst kind.

Now, a lot of people feel that the solution to all of this is to just ban reproductive cloning, make it illegal to produce a baby, but allow researchers in the lab to produce these embryos unrestricted for research purposes. They even hold out that somehow this could be used in clinical medicine someday.

I am a physician. I take care of patients with Alzheimer's disease, diabetes. I still see patients once a month. My father had diabetes, died of complications of diabetes. This is very, very fanciful science, to make claims that we must allow this research to proceed because it is going to lead to all of these ''cures.'' In my opinion, that is patently absurd.

Indeed, what they really are talking about is extracting some of these cells out of these so-called cloned embryos and doing what they call therapeutic cloning where they claim they can grow replacement tissues for people that have diseases.

One of the things that I have been arguing for, for well over a year now is that the arena of adult stem cells actually shows much more promise. Embryonic stem cells, there have been some problems in research studies where they tend to grow too much and actually can become tumor-like in their growth. We have been using adult stem cells in clinical research now for years, actually 20 years. There are some 50 clinical trials using adult stem cells. Indeed, just today, there was an article published in Nature, the most recent issue of Nature, and I think this came out of the University of Minnesota, that showed that they could get adult stem cells to become any tissue type, and they could get them to reproduce over and over and over again, essentially validating what people like myself have been saying for quite some time. The study is entitled ''Pluripotency of Mesenchymal, Stem Cells Derived From Adult Marrow.''

What they did in the study is they clearly showed that adult stem cells can reproduce and reproduce and reproduce as embryonic stem cells can, and that they can become any tissue type, essentially laying the debate to rest

that one has to have embryonic stem cells.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I wondered if it might be a good opportunity to take just 2 minutes to recognize the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS), because I am very interested, Mr. Speaker, in eliciting more information about the promise of adult stem cell research from the gentleman from Florida, which seems to me is the most deafening, in addition to the moral and ethical arguments against somatic cell transfer, therapeutic cloning for research, the most deafening argument beyond the morality is the promise of adult stem cell research.

So with that, with the gentleman's permission, I will yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS), the leader of the Values Action Team in the United States House of Representatives for the majority. He is without a doubt the strongest pro-family voice in the United States Congress.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue and for setting up this Special Order on their very timely issue.

A syndicated columnist, Charles Krauthammer, says that cloning is ''a nightmare and an abomination.'' I would concur with that. Cloning is like something from a bad science fiction movie. The only difference is that now, some scientists are actually on the verge of doing it. Now, these scientists try to deflect our criticism by claiming that they have no intention of cloning a person. They say they just want to clone human embryos so that they can take their stem cells, and they promise that they will kill the embryos before they grow to adulthood. So some have characterized them as cloning to kill.

Well, no one has said it better than The Washington Post. The Post said a few years ago: ''The creation of human embryos specifically for research that will destroy them is unconscionable.'' There is no difference between what they want to call ''research cloning'' and what they want to call ''reproductive cloning.'' The only difference is when they kill the human life that they have created.

Mr. Speaker, these unscrupulous scientists claim that the research they want to do could cure diseases one day. But the truth is, there is no evidence for that. Stem cells, as has been noted by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON), taken from adults have shown much more promise in research than stem cells taken from embryos. Besides, these same people insisted a few years ago that we had to let them do fetal tissue research, despite people's moral objections to taking tissue of aborted fetuses for research, because they said they might cure diseases.

Well, Mr. Speaker, where are those cures?

These people are like the boy who cried wolf. There is no reason we should believe them. Cloning human beings is wrong, simply wrong. Even if they could cure diseases through cloning, it would still be wrong. The vast majority of the American people want it banned, the House of Representatives has voted to ban it, the President of the United States wants to ban it, and we are all just waiting for the other body to do the right thing. I just hope we do not have to wait too long.

Mr. Speaker, I hope all of my colleagues will remember, if we do nothing, if the other body never acts and if there is no bill to send to the President, cloning, any kind of cloning, will be completely legal, and there be nothing we can do to stop it.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his profound moral clarity and for his continued leadership on issues related to the sanctity of human life.

With that I would like to yield back to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON). Specifically, if I may ask my colleague, as I said earlier in this hour that we have, it would be sufficient for me if we simply were arguing on the history and morality of Western civilization. The truth that rings out of our best traditions that he is God, and we are not, would be sufficient for me. But, Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) began to address, and I would ask him to elaborate on, the promise of adult stem cell research in itself argues against the expansion of or extension of science into the so-called embryonic or therapeutic cloning research. I would be grateful to have the gentleman elaborate on that.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Adult stem cells have been used in over 45 human clinical trials to treat human beings. Embryo stem cells have never been used successfully in any human clinical trial.

□ 1730

Indeed, embryo stem cells have not really been used successfully in any animal clinical trial up until recently. There was a study recently published, and I need to give the advocates for embryo stem cell research at least an honest appraisal, there was recently a research article in an animal model of Parkinson's disease, I believe, in rats, where they showed improvement in response to embryo stem cells in that particular case.

But hold that up against the tremendous amount of research that has been done with adult stem cells, and hold that up against this recent article that was just published in Nature showing the pluripotency of mesenchymal stem cells derived from adult marrow, suggesting none of the ethical and moral issues associated with embryo stem cells. Certainly cloning needs to be brought into play.

I will just point out, the advocates for embryo stem cell research may start quoting this recent article reported in Nature, using embryo stem cells to treat a rat model of Parkinson's disease as a reason they need to rush ahead with all of this. As I understand it, and I do not have the citation, there has been published, in abstract form at least, a case where an adult brain stem cell was used successfully to treat Parkinson's disease in a human being.

The point I am raising here is the adult stem cell research is way ahead of the embryo stem cell research. The embryo stem cell research is quite hypothetical. It is even more hypothetical to say that we have to do cloning, that cloning is somehow necessary.

What I honestly think is going on here, if the gentleman will continue to yield, is I think the research community and a lot of people in the scientific and biotechnology community know that therapeutic cloning is never likely to happen. What they really want to do, and this is speculation on my part, is they want to create cloned models of disease; in other words, taking somebody with a disease and making a clone of them, and then allow that clone to be used and manipulated in the lab so they can do research on that clone.

Indeed, I think the reason the biotechnology industry is so interested in this is they see this as an opportunity to patent that, and, in effect, one would be patenting a human being, and then exploit that for monetary gain; basically be able to sell these clones as models of disease so people could try to do genetic manipulations on them, or pharmacologic manipulations on them in the lab.

I just want to point out that this is the slippery slope. It is a big-time slippery slope. They talk about extracting stem cells from these things here, these embryos, and then growing them into the tissues that are needed. But there is excellent research that has been done in creating artificial wombs, and they have a very, very nice artificial womb that you can grow an embryo in up to 30 days, if I am not mistaken. So why would we not just take the fertilized egg, it would be much cheaper and quicker, put it in the artificial womb, grow it into the fetal stage, and then extract the tissue that is needed?

We may say, well, they would never do that; that sounds so terrible. But a year ago when we were debating embryo stem cell research, many of the people advocating embryo stem cell research were saying they would never sanction or approve the creation of embryos for scientific exploitation and then destruction. But yet that is now the very thing they are advocating for. So I think this is a very, very serious slippery slope.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the gentleman is familiar with the famous Nuremberg Code that was developed and emerged following the doctors' trial at Nuremberg in the late 1940s.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. I am.

Mr. PENCE. Most physicians are.

One of the principal tenets of the Nuremberg Code was that human subjects must consent to experiments; death or injury must not be anticipated results of the experiment; and the researcher must obtain the information they need by any other means possible before humans, including adequate animal experimentation.

There are other pieces of the Nuremberg Code that require that the researcher is admonished to test his disease first and foremost on animals, and no experiment should be undertaken after all of those have been followed and unless it can be foreseen to ''yield fruitful results for the good of society unprocurable by other methods.''

Now, it seems to me that the lessons of Nuremberg, and I would ask the gentleman to speak to that, the lessons of Nuremberg encapsulated in the Nuremberg Code are violated in several significant ways from the standpoint of medical ethics with regard to human experimentation, and most profoundly with regard to the fact that, as the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) has said here today, that these advances are procurable by other means than experimentation on human beings.

I wondered, I would ask the gentleman, am I right in my interpretation of the Nuremberg Code and its relevance to this?

Mr. WELDON of Florida. If the gentleman will continue to yield, yes, the gentleman brings up an extremely important point. The Nuremberg Code emerged in the aftermath of the atrocities committed by many physicians who were acting complicitly with the Nazis.

A great deal of scientific information was obtained from some of that research; for example, how long can a human survive in very, very cold water. When I was in medical school, many physicians in training, and, as well, many of our professors, felt so strongly what was done was evil that we should not even use the information; that we should just throw the information away, that it was so bad. The Code, of course, emerged.

The critical issue here is some people do not consider the embryo human because it does not have an organized central nervous system; it cannot respond to stimulation. But the critical issue here is where do we draw the line? It is human life; it is a developing human life. We all began that way.

Just as a year ago, they were saying we would never create an embryo to extract stem cells from, we only want to use the excess embryos from the fertility lab. Now they are saying, oh, we have to create these embryos to cure all these diseases. The next step will be, we have to do continued research and allow these embryos to grow in the lab to the point where they are developing a nervous system. So to me, the safest thing and the best thing to do is to make it illegal to create a clone at the very beginning.

I just want to point out, a lot of people who advocate cloning for research purposes, they all say, but I would never want to see reproductive cloning move ahead. I want to make a couple of points about that. If we have labs all over America creating cloned embryos, it will only be a matter of time before one of these embryos is implanted in a woman, because the implantation process occurs within the privacy of the doctor-patient relationship.

It would be impossible, and as a matter of fact, I have a letter from the Justice Department saying it would be impossible for them to police that. They would have to go into all these labs and keep track of all the embryos. It would be impossible for them as police agencies to know if a human embryo was replaced with an animal embryo and one was surreptitiously implanted in a woman. So the only way to effectively prevent this, in my opinion, is to ban it from the very, very beginning.

Also, we took testimony in my committee where the representative from the professional association of doctors who treat infertility kept saying in his testimony, a Dr. Cowan, how they did not support reproductive cloning at this time. He said it twice.

During the questioning period, I said to him, ''Why are you saying 'at this time?'''' And he made it very, very clear to me in his response to my questioning that they would like embryo cloning to proceed and research cloning to proceed so they could work through all the technical problems in cloning, such as large fetuses, threat to the health of the mother, and once all those problems were worked through, they would like to be able to offer reproductive cloning to infertile couples.

I thought that was a very, very significant statement, because it made it very, very clear to me that if we do not ban cloning at its very, very beginning, eventually we will have reproductive cloning. Either it will be done surreptitiously from embryos that have been spirited out of these labs and implanted in women, or it will be done openly by fertility experts.

So if the American people do not want cloning, the best way to prevent cloning from occurring is to ban it in its very beginning.

I want to just add one more thing, if the gentleman will continue to yield.

Mr. PENCE. Certainly.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, many liberals voted for the cloning ban. I thought that was one of the unique features that emerged from the debate on human cloning here in the House of Representatives. We had people of very, very divergent opinion. We had some Christian people, some Jewish people, Democrats, Republicans; we had liberals and conservatives.

Why is that? Why did people unite around this ban on human cloning? They came at it from different perspectives, and for many liberals it was a woman's rights issue.

This is an incredibly important point. It is getting inadequate discussion, in my opinion. If we are going to allow research cloning to proceed, these labs are going to need hundreds and possibly thousands of eggs. Where are they going to get these eggs? They are going to get them from women. How do you get eggs from a woman? You have to expose them to drugs. You have to give them drugs to cause something called superovulation. One of these drugs that they use has a 30 percent incidence of causing depression. Then you have to anesthetize the woman to extract the eggs.

Who will do that? What woman would put themselves through that, or submit themselves to exposure to a drug that has potential side effects including depression, and then submit to a general anesthetic to extract these eggs? We know who will do that: women who are desperate; poor women, women who are desperately in need of money. It will ultimately end up in exploitation of women.

I just want to read this quote from Judy Norsigian. She is the author of a book, 2 million copies have been printed and sold, Our Bodies, Ourselves. She is prochoice. But what does she say? ''Because embryo cloning will compromise women's health, turn their eggs and wombs into commodities, compromise their reproductive autonomy, and, with virtual certainty, lead to the production of 'experimental' human beings, we are convinced that the line must be drawn here.''

She was not alone. She was not the only person on the left who rose up. Stuart Newman and several others rose up and said, on this issue we agree with the conservatives, that human cloning should be banned. It is for that reason that we had such an extraordinary vote in the House of Representatives.

I feel very, very strongly that if we cannot get the other body to act on this issue, we minimally need to make it illegal to patent a human clone. I feel also very, very strongly that this is not only unethical, it is unnecessary.

The research data is showing more and more the huge, tremendous potential of adult stem cells, and that the embryo stem cells indeed may actually prove to be less advantageous to use. I honestly think as the science progresses on this that therapeutic cloning and reproductive cloning by the scientific community will ultimately be abandoned, and that the ultimate place that many of these advocates of cloning want to go to is creating cloned models of human disease that can be manipulated in the lab for the development of genetic treatments and for the development of pharmacological agents, and that they ultimately want to patent these things so they can make money off of them. I think that is what is ultimately going to end up driving this whole debate in the United States.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for his extraordinary remarks about not only unnecessary, but unethical therapeutic cloning.

I am very humbled, Mr. Speaker, not only to be joined by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON), the author of what we were able to do in the House in the area of banning reproductive cloning, but also to have been joined by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), one of the leading members of the Pro-Family Alliance.

But perhaps more than anyone in this institution, with the possible exception of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) is and has been for many, many years the leading voice for the sanctity of human life in the United States Congress. He holds the powerful chairmanship of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, but he speaks with enormous moral authority on issues related to life.

I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

□ 1745

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE), for yielding me this time, for taking out this time on this very important Special Order to look at the issue of cloning.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) certainly has been the leader of this historic legislation. He is the prime sponsor of the bill that passed in the House. It ought to be acted on in the other body as soon as possible for the sake of humanity, and for the sake of so many who would be injured irreparably by delay. Delay is denial, and I hope that Mr. DASCHLE and the leadership on the Senate side will rethink the dilatory tactics they have engaged in to preclude consideration of this important human rights legislation.

In the 21st century, bioethical issues, Mr. Speaker, really are the human rights issues, especially in Western democracies like the United States. I have spent 22 years working on human rights issues, including religious freedom and trafficking in persons. I was the prime sponsor of the antitrafficking legislation. Yesterday we had a day-long hearing on this scourge of human trafficking, which injures, hurts and ends in the rape of women; but in countries like the United States, where we have a sophisticated medical capability and a scientific capability, bioethical issues are really a human rights issue.

What we do for those prior to birth, those who are fragile, whether it be the issue of abortion or euthanasia or infanticide or, in this case cloning, we need to step up to the plate and not become enablers by inaction. We have become enablers of atrocities and human rights abuses. We cannot stand on the sidelines.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON), our leadership especially, including Speaker HASTERT and the rest of our leadership team, and a bipartisan, real healthy majority stepped up to the plate to pass this legislation, and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) has been a real leader in this Congress on these human rights issues, especially as it relates to the sanctity of human life.

Mr. Speaker, just let me say that promoting human cloning for research is indeed shockingly shortsighted, and it lacks a moral basis. I understand the drive to cure debilitating diseases and to improve health care for those who are suffering, because I have been fighting for funding for disease cures for 22 years as a Member of Congress.

I would just note parenthetically, I am the co-chairman of the Autism Caucus, I am co-chairman of the Alzheimer's Caucus. As my good friend indicated earlier, I am chairman of the full Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Half of our budget, approximately, is dedicated to health care. We have a significant research budget that we try to use as wisely as possible to help our spinal cord-injured veterans and a whole host of other problems from post-traumatic stress disorder right on through.

Let me just say, having fought like the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) and so many others trying to find cures for Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, cancer, lung disease, asthma, spina bifida, autism and a host of other debilitating diseases, it is cruel, I would respectfully submit, it is utterly cruel to tell those who suffer from these diseases that somehow they will be cured through the making of a clone of themselves to cannibalize for parts.

It is also cruel to divert limited resources from promising, ethical adult and umbilical stem cell research to unethical, impractical human cloning research. There is only so much money available; and as the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) pointed out a moment ago, in the area of regenerative medicine, adult stem cells, embryonic, cord blood, these hold enormous promise that goes underutilized when we go on this fantasy of creating clones.

Again, embryonic stem cell research derived from clones is unethical. On the other hand, we have the promise of real breakthroughs and then real application, as we are already doing with adult stem cells and umbilical cord stem cells. This research has no ethical baggage. These provide cures, they provide hope, and they provide rehabilitation and regenerative capabilities.

Mr. Speaker, human cloning is not just a slippery slope. It is indeed stepping off a moral cliff. If our government approved human cloning for research, it would be the first time we would sanction the special creation of human life for the sole purpose of destroying it. Not only would we be sanctioning human cloning, we would also have a law that would require the death of those human clones, whether it be at 5 days or 14 days or whatever new arbitrary line would be drawn.

Human cloning represents the commodification and eventual commercialization of human life, and it would create a class of human beings who exist not as ends in themselves, like all of us, but as a means to achieve the ends of others. A law that promotes human cloning for research is worse, far worse than no bill at all.

Once stockpiles of cloned human embryos are created for research, how realistic will it be really to have an implementation ban? Not only is allowing research cloning immoral, it would also not work. We do not fight the war on drugs by telling the public to manufacture as much cocaine as possible, pile it up in warehouses, but make sure to destroy it before anyone can smoke it or inhale it. If anyone suggested that strategy on the floor of the House, they would be criticized from here to breakfast; but that is exactly what the proponents of human cloning for research are advocating, and with a straight face. In addition, they are not talking about how these human embryo forms would be created.

Human embryos, if my colleagues read ''Brave New World'' and can look at the Orwellian visions we have had in the past, they can happen and will happen if the gentleman from Florida's (Mr. WELDON) historic legislation is not enacted and enacted soon.

The clock is running out on this, and I just want to say and reiterate what the good doc said a moment ago about the negative impact that this will have on women. If, as the proponents of research cloning claim happens, they will someday be able to cure human beings, which we do not think will happen, but say it does happen, we will see more drugs being used, super-ovulating drugs, to promote this egg harvesting.

I want to reiterate what the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) has on his plaque up there which was from, ''Our Bodies, Ourselves for the New Century,'' and it was written by a woman who does not agree with me or many of us on the pro-life issue of the right to life of the unborn, but she points out, Judy Norsigian, ''Because embryo cleaning will compromise women's health, turn their eggs and wombs into commodities, compromise their reproductive autonomy and, with virtual certainty, lead to the production of 'experimental' human beings, we are convinced that the line must be drawn here.''

She has joined us, as the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) pointed out, a number of other people who have never supported a pro-life piece of legislation to cross the line and say, wait a minute, time out, we are not going to go across that Orwellian line and manufacture human beings for the sole purpose of destroying them and then cannibalizing their remains.

This is important human rights legislation that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) has introduced, has gotten passed in the House with a bipartisan majority of both sides. We have got to pass it soon; and again, I call on the Senate, do not be enablers of

human rights abuses. We have got to find a way of getting this legislation down to President Bush. He has already signaled clearly and unmistakably, most recently in a White House ceremony, that he will sign this in a heartbeat. We have got to do this for the next generation and for the generations to come.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) for his passion and extraordinary complement of his participation in this and would yield for a moment before we close this Special Order to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman; and I just want to add, under President Clinton, he established the National Bioethics Advisory Commission, and they said, The commission began its discussions of cloning, fully recognizing that any efforts, any humans to transfer a somatic cell nucleus into an enucleated egg involves the creation of an embryo with the apparent potential to be implanted in utero and developed to term, what they mean by that is a baby, and that is really what this is all about.

Is it a human life? What is going to happen to it? Are we going to create, exploit it and discard it? Are we going to allow them to be manufactured into human beings, the first man-created human in the history of the world?

I say we do not cross that Orwellian line; we draw the line here, the line of morality and ethics and say, no, we do not want to go there.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) for his thoughtful comments today and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS). Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for these men of colossal stature in this institution and in this country to join us.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, as I close, we must decide whether we will master science or be mastered by it. It is the fundamental moral and ethical question of our time. As the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) said, we must prevent human life from becoming a wholesale commodity that is created and consumed.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, we must be about the values of the American people, people like Mike and Denice Dora, farmers in Rush County, Indiana, of 15 years, our friends; but they are people who look and open up that ancient book upon which our founders placed so much trust that says, ''Remember this and consider, recall it to mind, you transgressors, remember the former things of old; for I am God, and there is no other; I am God, and there is none like me.''

This debate must center around that conviction, those values; and if it does, we will prevent this moral horror of human cloning at any level, for any purpose, from becoming a reality in American civilization.

MINORITY HOMEOWNERSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, this month was declared homeownership month, and there will be several Members who probably will be joining me. I know that the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) has already submitted her remarks for the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, over the last few days, the President has been promoting an initiative to increase homeownership opportunities for minorities and reduce barriers. The President's interest and participation is welcome.

Mr. Speaker, those of us in the Congressional Black Caucus have been working hard for years to correct the inequities and eliminate the disparities of housing opportunities for people of color and are pleased that the President has recognized the need for such an effort.

All we can say is WOW. More than a year ago, the Congressional Black Caucus and the Congressional Black Caucus Foundation launched an ambitious initiative called With Ownership Wealth, or WOW for short. The President's new plan echoes and amplifies many of our initial goals but may not have realized the objectives we share in common. To the extent the President is joining the lead of the Congressional Black Caucus Foundation and comprehensive group of sponsors which include the housing financing industry, the insurance industry Realtors and nonprofit organizations, including faith-based organizations, as well as community development organizations, it is indeed a step in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Black Caucus and its foundation took the initiative on housing and homeownership opportunities because for too long the dream of homeownership for minorities has been a bit of wishful thinking. We have been working towards making those wishes a reality. More detailed information about the foundation's With Ownership Wealth, or WOW, as we call it, can be found on the Internet, which is www.wowcbcf.org.

Mr. Speaker, representing a district in North Carolina that is not only predominantly rural but also is heavily populated by Afro-Americans and other minorities I welcome the President's stated intention to step up to help create greater wealth in communities where housing needs are so critical. At a minimum, the administration announcement should increase interest of our industry players and minority homeownership acquisition.

That said, I must point out that just as there is a great gap between majority and minority homeownership, so too there is a gap between the President's words or his promise or his intention and his administrative work. The President's announcement this week does not mention that his budget has slashed rural housing programs essentially from the 2002 level, including a 12.4 percent reduction in funds for guaranteeing homes for single-family housing and 11.4 percent cut in the Department of Agriculture direct loan for single family housing and a whopping 47.4 percent for direct loan for rental housing.

□ 1800

There is a significant gap between the promise and the reality. Mr. Speaker, African Americans nationwide have a home ownership rate of 48 percent compared with the majority rate of 73 percent. Politicians of both parties, Democrat and Republican, wax rhapsodically, eloquently. They say great words, great phrases about the American dream. They talk endlessly about the American dream and the right to own a home, and they also talk about the United States being the land of opportunity. For many, yes, but not for all.

It is time that the reality mirrors the rhetoric and the deeds match the words with action. It is time now that we indeed make it a reality that the American dream to own a home is made available not only to those with a lot of money, but also those who have moderate resources should not be denied, or those of African American or other minorities. It should be the right for all Americans to have that.

So I look forward to reviewing the administration's new housing and home ownership proposal and look forward to working with the administration to pass a program to help people really realize the dream. The land of opportunity should mean something more than words, and I hope that the President's promise to reduce the barriers and to make home ownership available for minorities is indeed a reality, and that resources would indeed follow the commitment.

I am pleased to be joined in this special order, home ownership, by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to, first of all, thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) for her leadership on so many issues. I mean, she has provided outstanding leadership in the area of agriculture and in the area of making sure that there is food for people who are hungry not only here in the United States, but worldwide. And she has certainly been the Congressional Black Caucus's leader when it comes to home ownership. She has provided leadership as we have tried to get our WOW initiative under way, and as a matter of fact, it is pretty difficult to keep up with her in terms of all of the many areas in which she has worked, and it is certainly a pleasure to join with her this evening.