

from New Jersey founded the Congressional Missing and Exploited Children's Caucus.

□ 1430

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

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

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

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

STATEMENT AGAINST FEDERAL FUNDING OF EMBRYONIC STEM CELL RESEARCH

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

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

This is clearly a very emotional issue with strong views on both sides. 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 can see the morally troubling question behind embryonic stem cell research. Is it justifiable to purposefully end one life even if it results in the salvation of millions of others?

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

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

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

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

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

Even the Clinton National Bioethics Advisory Commission said that embryo destructive research should go forward only "if no less morally problematic alternatives are available for the research." They did not say to go forward with embryonic and adult stem cell research so we can see what works better. They did not say the alternatives had to work better than embryo destructive research. The only criteria that they gave is if there was a less morally problematic alternative to embryo destroying research, then using embryos would not be justifiable.

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

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

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

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

SUPPORT FOR THE DECISION TO REJECT UNITED-US AIRWAYS MERGER

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

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

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

The Department of Justice and the Department of Transportation must now continue their vigilance to maintain strong and healthy competition in aviation and prohibiting barriers to competition that result from mergers, from biased reservation systems, and from predatory pricing practices. I congratulate the Justice Department for completing a thorough painstaking analysis of this proposed merger, reviewing its effects on hub-to-hub non-stop service in currently competitive