EXONERATION OF CAPTAIN CHARLES B. MCVAY III

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of the House of Representatives a decision by the Department of the Navy that exonerated the late Charles Butler McVay III, captain of the heavy cruiser, the USS Indianapolis, who was court-martialed and convicted 56 years ago after his ship sank in the closing days of World War II.

The survivors of that tragedy, Mr. Speaker, have relentlessly sought to have Captain McVay vindicated, and those who remain are relieved by the Navy’s long-delayed yet justifiable decision.

On May 14, 1999, I ushered an 11-year-old constituent from Florida to drop H.J. Res. 48 into the system for consideration by the House. Hunter Scott went to a movie in Pensacola, Florida, and saw Jaws, in which there was a brief soliloquy about the sinking of the USS Indianapolis. Hunter’s interest in the ship’s disaster was the beginning of a school history project, trips to Washington, D.C., media attention, and an upcoming movie.

Language to exonerate Captain McVay was inserted in the Defense Authorization Act of 2001. The legislation expresses the sense of Congress that Captain McVay should be exonerated because some facts important to the case were never considered by the 1945 court-martial board. Classified data were not even made available to the board.

Survivors of the greatest sea disaster in our Navy’s history at that time sought to clear their captain’s name, only 120 remain alive today. One of our strongest supporters has been Michael Monroney. Mike, the son of the late Senator A.S. Mike Monroney of Oklahoma and the retired vice president of TWR, Inc., is no stranger to Indiana. Mike served as administrative assistant to former Congressman John Brademas of Indiana in his first term.

Mike has an original poem, Mr. Speaker, which tells the story of the sinking of the USS Indianapolis, the fight for the survival of his crew, and the steadfast loyalty to their Captain.

EXONERATION OF CAPTAIN CHARLES B. MCVAY III

I submit herewith for the RECORD his poem:

TO HONOR ADAM WALSH

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

Mr. LAMPSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to invite my colleagues to join me as a member of the Congressional Missing and Exploited Children’s Caucus, and I choose to make yet another plea to my colleagues for them to join this caucus, because today marks the 20th anniversary of the abduction of Adam Walsh.

Many of my colleagues are familiar with John Walsh, the host of America’s Most Wanted. John and his wife, Reve, lived through the personal tragedy of having their 6-year-old son, Adam, abducted and murdered at the hands of a stranger in 1981. After suffering through this tremendously emotional ordeal, John became a dedicated advocate to end violence against children, to fight crime, and to expand victims’ rights in our criminal justice system.

John has shown, through his efforts and over 19 years of hard work, that one committed individual can make a difference to benefit all. Working with his wife, John became the Nation’s leading advocate in the cause of protecting our children from violence and 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...
The purpose of this caucus is threefold. One, to build awareness around the issue of missing and exploited children, 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. Kink). 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. Viewpoints 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 have 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. This means the person from whom an embryonic cell 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 embryonic destructive research. The only criteria that they gave is if there was a less morally problematic alternative to embryonic destructive research, then using embryos would not be justifiable.

The purpose of this caucus is threefold. One, to build awareness around the issue of missing and exploited children, to introduce legislation that would strengthen law enforcement, community organizing and school-based efforts to address child abduction.

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. Kink). 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. Viewpoints 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 have 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. This means the person from whom an embryonic cell 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 embryonic destructive research. The only criteria that they gave is if there was a less morally problematic alternative to embryonic destructive research, then using embryos would not be justifiable.

This is from the National Bioethics Advisory Commission, September 1999, this quote, "In our judgment, the decision 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 should be protected.

These are but a few doctrines of the Nuremberg Code which I ask you to consider while the Nation and the President grapple 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...