

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2505, HUMAN CLONING PROHIBITION ACT OF 2001

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 214 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 214

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2505) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit human cloning. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The amendments recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the bill, as amended, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; (2) the further amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by Representative Scott of Virginia or his designee, which shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; (3) after disposition of the amendment by Representative Scott, the further amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the report of the Committee on Rules, if offered by Representative Greenwood of Pennsylvania or his designee, shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (4) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Committee on Rules met and granted a structured rule for H.R. 2505, the Human Cloning Prohibition Act. The rule provides for 1 hour of debate in the House equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. The rule waives all points of order against the bill. The rule provides that the amendments recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The rule makes in order the amendment printed in the Rules Committee report accompanying the rule if offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) or a designee which shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided

and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. The rule makes in order after disposition of the Scott amendment the further amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the Rules Committee report accompanying the rule if offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) or a designee, which shall be considered as read and shall be separately debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. The rule waives all points of order against the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the report. Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, this is a fair rule which will permit a thorough discussion of all the relevant issues. In fact, Members came before the Committee on Rules yesterday and testified on two amendments. This rule allows for both of those amendments to be heard. The first of these amendments is the Greenwood substitute which allows human cloning for medical purposes. I oppose the Greenwood amendment because it is wrong to create human embryo farms, even for scientific research. The Committee on Rules, though, recognizes that the gentleman from Pennsylvania's proposal is the leading alternative to a ban on human cloning. Because we are aiming for a fair and thorough debate, we should make it in order on the House floor.

The second amendment is a proposal by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) to fund a study on human cloning. Again because the Committee on Rules recognizes the importance of this issue and wants a fair and open debate, we have decided that the gentleman from Virginia's study deserves House consideration.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) said in our Rules Committee meeting yesterday, this is an extremely important and a very complex issue.

□ 1315

Science is on the verge of cloning human embryos for both medical and reproductive purposes. Congress cannot face a weightier issue than the ethics of human cloning, and Congress should not run away from this problem. It is our job to address such pressing moral dilemmas, and it is our job to do so in a deliberative way. We do so today.

This bill and this rule represent the best of Congress. The Committee on the Judiciary held days of hearings on the Human Cloning Prohibition Act, with the Nation's leading scientists and ethicists. Today, this rule allows for floor consideration of the two most important challenges to the human cloning bill of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON.) If we wait to act, human cloning will go forward unregulated, with frightening and ghoulish consequences.

I have spent a lot of time considering this issue, because it is so complex; and I have decided to vote to ban human cloning. It is simply wrong to clone human beings. It is wrong to create fully grown tailor-made cloned babies, and it is wrong to clone human embryos to experiment on and destroy them. Anything other than a ban on human cloning would license the most ghoulish and dangerous enterprise in human history.

Some of us can still remember how the world was repulsed during and after World War II by the experiments conducted by the Nazis in the war. How is this different?

I urge my colleagues to support this rule, and I urge my colleagues to support the underlying measure.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I will be blunt: This is a bad bill and a bad rule. This is Congress again playing scientist, and I urge defeat of the rule and defeat of the underlying bill in its current form.

In its efforts to address the issue of human cloning, my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) has managed to duplicate the controversy arising from the administration's debate over whether to ban federally funded stem cell research.

Mr. Speaker, there is a strong consensus in Congress that the cloning of human beings should be prohibited. For many people, the prospect of human cloning raises a specter of eugenics and genetic manipulation of traits like eye color or intelligence, and none of us want to see these types of abuses. Yet H.R. 2505 and its excessive fear of science and the possibilities of scientific research attempts to deprive the American people of their hope for cures and their faith in the power of human discovery.

The Human Cloning Prohibition Act goes far beyond a ban on cloning of an individual known as reproductive cloning. This legislation actually also bans stem cell research and, finally, would prohibit the importation of products that are developed through this kind of research.

As a former scientist, I am profoundly concerned about the impact this proposal would have on our Nation's biotechnical industry. If we ban stem cell research, we risk ceding the field of medical research to other nations. Top scientists in the field are already leaving the United States due to the mere threat that this type of research may be banned.

If H.R. 2505 is passed, we must accept the fact that preeminent scientists, and, indeed, entire research facilities

will move overseas, in order to pursue their studies. If we stifle our Nation's research efforts, patients will suffer as well.

This research holds the potential to treat diseases that afflict millions of Americans, including diabetes, cancer, heart disease, stroke, Parkinson's, Alzheimer's, brain or spinal cord injury or multiple sclerosis. If scientists overseas were to develop a cure for cancer using stem cells from a cloned embryo, Americans would be banned from taking advantage of that cure here in the United States because we could not import it. Surely we should not deny our constituents access to life-saving cures.

Moreover, we should be prepared for the evolution of two classes of patients, those with the resources to travel abroad to receive the cure and those who are too poor and must therefore stay in the United States to grow sicker and die.

Fortunately, we have before us a balanced responsible alternative, the substitute offered by our colleagues, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH).

The House of Representatives stands today at a crossroads in our support for scientific endeavors.

Mr. Speaker, we really should not be debating this at all. None of us is equipped to do so. We simply do not know enough, and for this House to take the step that we are about to take today is unconscionable.

We must not allow our fears about research to overwhelm our hopes for curing disease. We must not isolate this Nation from the rest of the scientific world by banning therapeutic cloning.

Make no mistake, we are sailing into uncharted waters. Our decision here today could have consequences for generations to come.

Under this inadequate rule, the majority is giving us a meager 2 hours to hold this momentous debate. So I urge my colleagues to vote no on the rule and no on H.R. 2505.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON), the sponsor of this bill.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time. I rise obviously to speak in support of this rule and in support of my underlying bill and in opposition to the substitute.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by just talking a little bit about the basic science of all of this. What is shown on this poster to my left is a normal fertilization of an egg. Normal human cells have 46 chromosomes; the egg has 23, the sperm has 23. When united, they become a fertilized egg, which then begins to differentiate into an embryo.

Here is depicted a 3-day embryo and then a 7-day embryo.

Under the technique called somatic cell nuclear transfer, you take a cell from somebody's body. This could be a skin cell, depicted here. You extract the nucleus out, which is shown here. Then you take a female egg, a woman's egg. You remove the nucleus that was in there, which is shown here being discarded with the 23 chromosomes, so you have an enucleated egg. Then you implant that nucleus in there. This becomes a clone of the individual who donated this cell. From this point on, it begins to develop like a normal embryo.

Now, there will be some discussion today, I anticipate, where people will try to assert that this is not a human embryo; that this somehow is, and this is somehow not a human embryo.

I studied embryology in medical school. I am a physician. I practiced medicine for 15 years. Indeed, I brought my medical school embryology textbook, and I would defy anybody in this body to tell me what the science behind making the assertion that this is not a human embryo. There is absolutely no basis in science to make such a claim.

This technique, which we are banning in humans, is how Dolly was created. They took a cell from the udder of a sheep; then they took a sheep's egg, removed the nucleus, took the nucleus out of this cell and put it in that egg depicted right there. Then it was put in tissue culture, where it became a more developed embryo, and then it was implanted in another sheep to create Dolly.

Now, to assert that a human embryo created by the somatic cell nuclear transfer technique is not a human embryo is like saying this was not a sheep embryo. Well, what is this? This is Dolly. To say that a human embryo created by nuclear transfer technology is not a human embryo to me is the equivalent of saying this is not a sheep.

Now, I have, I think, some pretty good quotes to support my position. This is from the Bioethics Advisory Commission. The Commission began its discussion fully recognizing that any efforts in humans to transfer somatic cell nucleus into an enucleated egg involves the creation of an embryo. So they support my argument. They have to, it is science, with the apparent potential to be implanted in a uterus and developed to term.

I have another quote from one of the Commissioners, Alex Capron. "Our cloning report, when read in light of subsequent developments in that field and of the stem cell report, supports completely halting attempts to create human embryos through SCNT," or somatic cell nuclear transfer, "at this time."

Now, I just want to point out, this is not a stem cell debate. There will be

people who will try to make this a stem cell argument. My legislation does not make it illegal to do embryonic stem cell research.

I would also like to point out this is not an abortion debate. Judy Norsigian is shown here quoted, she is pro-choice, she is the co-author of "Our Bodies, Ourselves for the New Century" with the Boston Women's Health Collective. "There are other pro-choice groups that have supported my position that we do not want to go to this place, because embryo cloning will compromise women's health, turn their eggs and wombs into commodities, compromise their reproductive autonomy, with virtual certainty lead to the production of experimental human beings. We are convinced that the line must be drawn here."

Finally, I have a quote from the National Institutes of Health guidelines for research using human pluripotent stem cells. They deny Federal funding for research utilizing pluripotent stem cells that were derived from human embryos created for research purposes, research in which human pluripotent stem cells are derived using somatic cell nuclear transfer, the transfer of a human somatic cell into the human egg.

Now, there are some people who have been approaching me saying why are we having this debate now? Well, there is a company in this country that has already harvested eggs from women. They want to start creating clones. So the issue is here now. If we are going to put a stop to this, the House, I think, needs to speak and the other body needs to take this issue up as well.

Additionally, this is a women's health issue. There was one article published, I believe in the New England Journal. The way they harvest these eggs is they give women a drug called Pergonal that causes super-ovulation. Then they have to anesthetize them to harvest the eggs. They typically use coeds. It is a class issue, who is going to volunteer for this procedure? Poor women?

Let me tell Members what: The study showed that women who were exposed to this drug have a slightly higher incidence of ovarian cancer. So this is not a trivial issue, in my opinion. It is a women's health issue. I believe the rule that has been crafted is a very fair rule. It will provide for plenty of debate.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH).

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, there are two bills before us today, effectively, the Weldon bill and then the Greenwood bill, that I am an original sponsor with.

Let us be very, very clear to each other and to the American people. Both of those bills absolutely totally ban human cloning. I am going to say that

again so there is no debate on that. They absolutely, totally ban human cloning. There is unanimity, I think, in this Congress, in the American public, about that. There are some extreme, extreme groups that are distinct minorities, but I do not believe there will be one Member who will stand up here and say we should do it.

We should not do it, for both ethical and practical reasons. Before Dolly the Sheep was created, and I am not going to talk about all the ethical reasons. I will talk for a second about the practical reasons. And there are very serious ethical reasons against it. But before Dolly the Sheep was created, 270 sheep died; and Dolly is severely handicapped. I do not think any of us can even contemplate that in terms of the human condition.

Let us talk about what this debate is really about. It is not about human cloning. We are all against human cloning. What it is about is the Weldon bill further bans somatic cell nuclear transfer. I am going to say that term again, because that is a term that all the Members who are going to vote in this Chamber and, in fact, in a sense all of the American people at some point are going to have to understand that term.

I think all of my colleagues now understand the term embryonic stem cells, and I think the vast majority of Americans understand the term embryonic stem cells. In fact the majority of Members, in fact, the debate about stem cell research is over. A majority of this Congress, a majority of the other body, both support embryonic stem cell research, and a vast majority of the American people across polling data, 75, 80 percent consistently of the American people, support embryonic stem cell research.

They do it and that breaks up into every sub-group of our population. In terms of Catholics, the number is about 75-80 percent. People who identify themselves as Evangelical Christians, 75-80 percent support embryonic stem cell research.

□ 1330

But what this Weldon bill tries to ban is somatic cell nuclear transfer.

Now, I really hate doing this to my colleagues and this is really one of the reasons why we ought to defeat this rule today, but I have to do a little bit of layman's science. This is a chart, and I will make it available for Members, that actually shows what somatic cell nuclear transfer does.

Most of us understand that by any definition, an embryo is created when an egg and a sperm join with the potentiality of a unique human being. That is not what this procedure is about. I am going to say these things again, because for most of my colleagues they have not heard this before, and this is somewhat of a science lesson.

A normal embryo, what we think of as an embryo, is created by an egg and a sperm joining with the potentiality of a unique human being.

Mr. Speaker, that is not what this bill attempts to ban. What it bans is somatic cell nuclear transfer. Again, as the chart shows, one takes an egg, an unfertilized egg, an egg, and one then takes out the chromosomes from that egg and then, literally, in the trillions of cells in a body and, in other species, they take it out. Obviously, in the human species, it is the female, of the literally trillions of cells that exist in the human body, they take out one of those cells and take out the 46 chromosomes out of one of those cells and then put it into an egg.

At that point, why are they doing that? Let us talk about that a little bit. This is part and parcel, this debate really is totally intertwined.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH) said this is not about stem cell research. It is about stem cell research because, let us talk about what is going on.

Stem cell research, one of the reasons why the American people have effectively said they want embryonic stem cell research is because they understand the debate. They understand the debate at several levels.

At the first level they understand that in in vitro fertilization embryos are created that literally get thrown away. We have a choice. We can use those for research that literally has the ability to cure the most horrific diseases humankind has ever seen, whether that is paralysis, whether that is Alzheimer's, or any number of diseases.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEUTSCH. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman, does it trouble him that with all of the difficulty he is having trying to explain what this is about, that our colleagues are going to be coming down here pretty soon and voting on it, and it will affect everybody in the United States.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentlewoman 100 percent, which is one of the reasons to defeat this rule. In my 9 years in this Chamber, this is the least informed collectively that the 435 Members of this body have ever been on any issue, and in many ways, it is as important as any issue we face.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, it is frightening.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, why is this about stem cell research? As I said, what the American people have said, and I was talking about in vitro fertilization, that we have the ability to take these embryos and do research on them to literally cure disease, and the research

is there. This past week, stem cells were inserted into a primate's spine and a primate that previously had been unable to move was able to move.

Just today, in today's Wall Street Journal, there is a report on research of stem cells actually being able to create insulin cells. It is in today's Wall Street Journal. This stuff is happening. Diseases that had existed in the past, polio, other diseases have been cured. We are getting there. We literally can. If we talk to the patients' groups, if we listen to what Nancy Reagan is saying, if we listen to the families, there are literally tens of millions.

I will move this next chart over here just to show my colleagues. This is the number of people in America that we are talking about. We are not talking about millions, we are talking about tens of millions of people who are personally affected by these diseases, and if we put their families in, we are talking about literally maybe 100 million people in this country who are affected by these diseases.

Now again, let us talk specifically about: how does this intertwine with stem cell research? It is very similar to the issue of organ transplants. If we put an organ into someone's body, it will be rejected. There are antirejection drugs which scientifically do not apply to stem cells.

The best way to be able to actually maybe get a therapeutic use out of this research, actually cure cancer, cure Parkinson's, cure Alzheimer's, cure juvenile diabetes, the actual way to do that is to develop research to develop a therapy to actually put the stem cells into the body, and that is exactly what is being done here. Cells from a person's body are being used, through somatic cell nuclear transfer, to be able to create the potentiality of curing these horrific diseases.

Calling that an embryo does not make it an embryo. It is not an embryo. It is not creating life by any definition of creating life. It is the potentiality to continue life.

I would say it in several ways. If someone, by reason of their theology, their personal belief system, does not allow them to do that, then I say let them choose not to do that. But for the tens of millions of patients, 100 million family members, do not stop them from doing it, number one. This bill goes to an extreme and even says that we cannot import drugs for use in this country. I am sure there is not a Member in this chamber who could look a family member in the eye of one of those tens of millions of Americans when that drug is created in England or France or Ireland or wherever and say, you cannot have that drug. I know there is not a Member that could do it, and we should not do it today.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time. We are going to have a lot of debate and I assume some of the arguments that the gentleman has put forward will be debated further in the course of the afternoon. I will just point out one or two quick things.

The procedure that they would like to make legal is illegal in several European countries. There is really only one that currently allows it, and they have come under a lot of criticism. I think by passing my bill, we actually bring the United States into conformity with a lot of thinking that is going on in the world.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH) mentioned a "study" where paralysis had been reversed. I do not know where he got that reference from. There was a story in the press of a rat that had paralysis and a lot of the press reported it as embryonic stem cells. It was not embryonic stem cells, it was fetal stem cells. It was not even a study, it was a scientist who took some video footage. It was not peer reviewed. Nevertheless, it was reported in the press as a "study."

This is not about embryonic stem cell research, it is about whether or not we are going to carry this whole issue one step further, no longer using the excess embryos in the clinics, but now creating embryos for research purposes.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, today, the House is faced with one of the most complex and potentially far-reaching medical and ethical issues it will ever face. As a body, we should have time to examine the ramifications of the many issues involved in cloning, time for deliberative judgment, time for exploring alternatives and crafting enforceable legislation. But today, we are not being given that time, and that is why we must reject this rule.

We are being given less than 3 hours today when most Members have not had the time to understand and explore the potent ramifications of this issue to decide an issue which will not only impact tens of millions of Americans today, but will also impact future generations.

Cloning is one of the most important and far-reaching issues we will examine in our public service. Its impact may be incalculable. Cloning will alter our world. It is true that powerful, potent and perhaps dangerous research efforts currently proceed unchecked. Technological knowledge grows exponentially with new and important results announced daily. The rush of data creates a surging, uncontrolled current that finds its own course.

We must not legislate long after the damage has been done, and that is why we need to try to find a way to have

foresight and vision, providing leadership for others around the world. We must find a way to ban human cloning, while allowing research to continue.

Therefore, I support the revised Greenwood-Deutsch substitute which bans reproductive cloning, but allows strictly regulated, privately funded therapeutic cloning. Reproductive cloning practices which must be banned are an attempt to create a new human being and, as we heard in hearings throughout the spring, there are fringe groups who would like to clone humans. This is wrong, and it must be stopped.

Conversely, somatic cell nuclear transfer, or so-called "therapeutic cloning," is the way to take stem cell research and all of its promise from the lab to the patient who has diabetes, Parkinson's Disease, Alzheimer's, spinal cord injury, and other health problems. Stem cell research helps us take a stem cell, a cell that is a building block to be made into any other cell, and turn that cell into a variety of different tissues for the body.

But medical experts tell us that that stem cell, because the DNA differs from the DNA of the individual that the new tissue is to be donated to, will often be rejected, because the genetic makeup of that tissue is different. Somatic cell nuclear transfer gets around that problem of rejection, because the stem cells that create the organ or tissue are from the patient. As a result, the patient's body will not recognize the organ or tissue as a foreign object.

Let me give my colleagues an example. A diabetic, if we take a cell and we make a stem cell and then we make an Islet cell that produces insulin from that stem cell, the person's body will still reject that Islet cell without immunosuppressive drugs because the DNA is different. But with somatic stem cell transfer, if we take an egg, an unfertilized human egg, we remove the 23 chromosomes and we take the diabetic patient and replace the 23 chromosomes with 46 of that own patient's chromosomes, we can make Islet cells that that person's body will not reject.

The other thing, the very dangerous thing the Weldon bill does is, if there are nonhuman cloning techniques which are used for therapies abroad, we can never import those therapies, to have to say to someone who needs a skin graft that a therapy developed overseas cannot be used to replace one's own healthy skin.

The ancient Greeks developed mythological answers for questions they did not understand. Their mythology brought order into chaos. We do not have that luxury in our society. We cannot stand back, shrug our shoulders and say, it is the will of the gods. Cloning is man's discovery and man has to take control over cloning and all of its consequences, good and bad.

Mr. Speaker, I urge rejection of this rule, and I also urge adoption of the

Greenwood-Deutsch substitute. Let us have a debate. Let us have a full discussion, and let us figure this out in a way all of us can be proud of in a reasonable, not a political way.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD)

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time. I also want to thank my opponent in this debate, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON), for letting me use one of his charts to which I will refer in a moment.

This rule makes in order the Greenwood-Deutsch substitute. The Greenwood-Deutsch substitute, just like the base bill, makes it illegal to create a human being through cloning. We all, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) and I, and all of the speakers we will hear from today, all believe that it is not safe and it is not ethical to create a new human being through cloning. We need to ban that.

What we do not want to ban is, as has been said, the somatic cell nuclear transfer research, because that, my colleagues, that is what gives us the most promising opportunity to cure the diseases that have plagued humanity for centuries.

□ 1345

Every one of us has had the experience that I have had in my office over and over again: a mother and father bring in their little diabetic child, sometimes with a big bottle of needles showing how many times they must inject themselves while they buy time to see if diabetes will eventually kill them.

Every one of us has had the experience that I have had where a beautiful young mother comes into the office, she cannot raise her arms for Lou Gehrig's disease, and is trying to raise a child and trying to race death that is certain to come from Lou Gehrig's disease.

We have all had people in our office trembling from Parkinson's. We have all had people in our office tell us the tragic stories of their parents with Alzheimer's. We have all had people come to visit us in wheelchairs, quadriplegics, paraplegics, with life-ending, life-destroying spinal injuries. We work on people who have suffered from head injuries, never to regain their normal function, and people in coma.

We have all heard these stories. What do we do? We do the best thing we can think of. We say, let us double the funding for the National Institutes of Health. Let us spend billions of dollars to save these people, to save future generations from the scourge of premature death, disability, torturous pain.

What is the research that we think is going to be done to find these miracle

cures? Mr. Speaker, it is somatic cell nuclear transfer.

Let us look at this diagram. What the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) did not say in his explanation of the diagram is that when we take the skin cell, the somatic cell, and put it in the nucleus of the denucleated or enucleated cell and allow it to divide for 5 to 7 days, when we get to this point, when we get to the point where we have that cell division, we stop the process of cell division and extract from that blastocyst pluripotent stem cells.

When we have those stem cells, the scientists do research where they look at the proteins and the growth factors at work; and they say, what made that skin cell from someone's cheek become a stem cell, a magical stem cell that can become anything? And then, what miraculous proteins and processes can convert that pluripotent stem cell into a specialized spine cell or brain cell or liver cell?

When they unlock that secret through this research, what they will be able to do to our constituents is that little child with diabetes will be able to have some of its skin cells taken, turned in with these proteins, no more eggs, no more embryonic work at all, take her somatic cell, convert it into a stem cell, and convert it into the islets for her liver, convert it into the cells that will cure and repair her spine, convert it into the cells that wake a comatose patient back into consciousness. That is what this research holds for us.

Now, why would we kill this research? Why would we condemn for the world and for future generations not to have the benefit of this miracle? We would do it because some will say, but wait a minute, once we put the cheek cell of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) into this empty cell and it divides, we have a soul. That is the metaphysical question here, do we have a soul there?

Mr. Speaker, I would be mightily surprised if we took my cheek cell and put it in a petri dish and it divided, that God would choose that moment to put a soul on it, and say, Mr. GREENWOOD's cheek cell is dividing; quick, give it a soul. It has to have a soul. Then we can hold hands and circle it and say, It must now become a human being. Mr. GREENWOOD's cheek cell is dividing. It has a soul. It has to live.

That is ridiculous. It is ridiculous. It does not say that in the New Testament. What the New Testament says is love; and with this therapy, we make the love a reality.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, it is worth reading the bill that is before us today. If we do read the bill, as I have and the other members of the Com-

mittee on the Judiciary, we will see that the bill outlaws somatic cell nuclear transfer. It makes it a felony with a 10-year sentence.

If we read further in the bill, there is a ban and also a felony remedy for those who ship or receive any products that are derived from somatic cell nuclear transfer.

Now, what does this mean? This means that scientists in labs around the country who are doing research and who may have cultures of cells that are products of somatic cell nuclear transfer will soon become felons in their labs if they ship or send these cells to colleagues in the scientific world.

Further, under the bill, it is illegal, it is a crime, to accept a cure that is developed outside the United States if a cure for a disease is the product of somatic cell nuclear transfer.

Now, that is a very realistic possibility. Just last month, this month, the head of stem cell research at the University of California in San Francisco announced that he was leaving the United States because he could not do his research in the United States. He is moving to England. When he joins other scientists in England, there is quite a good chance that they will come up with cures for horrible diseases that are suffered throughout the world, including America.

If we pass this bill, we are saying Americans are not allowed to get those cures. That, too, would become a crime.

The National Institutes of Health mentioned in their recent report that the human ES-derived cells could be advantageous for transplantation purposes if they did not trigger an immune rejection. They also point out in the next paragraph that "potential immunological rejection of human ES-derived cells might be avoided for by using nuclear transfer technology to generate these cells."

I urge my colleagues to vote against this rule. It is preposterous that we are allowing ourselves 2 hours of debate to decide whether we should call to a screeching halt research that has the promise of curing cancer, of allowing those who have suffered spinal cord injuries to recover, allowing Alzheimer's victims to recover, allowing Parkinson's victims to recover.

We should reject this bill. We all agree that cloning of human beings is something we ought to outlaw. Let us not outlaw research along with that.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN), the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, let me first say that I think we are all in agreement that cloning to reproduce human beings

ought to be illegal, and the FDA does not have authority in my view to make it legal today. All they have is authority to say it is a safe process or not, and that is the last authority they have on the subject. We need to make cloning of human beings illegal.

The tougher question is one the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) poses: Should we have therapeutic cloning for research purposes to get stem cells?

If that were the only place to get stem cells, if that were the only way in which to learn these incredible cures and these incredible possibilities for replacing human organs and curing diabetes, that would be a pretty tough debate for us today. But we are not in that position.

I commend Members to an article in Discover Magazine that has just come out this month about four remarkable brothers, the Vacanti brothers. In the article, they talk about amazing breakthroughs not in stem cell research but in research that has discovered some 3-micron, very small, cells in every mammalian species, including human beings.

They have experimented with these cells. They have tried to freeze them; they have tried to cook them. They have frozen them at minus 21 degrees. They have left them at 187 degrees for 30 minutes. They have starved them of oxygen. They have lived and replicated. They have used them now in experiments going as far as rebuilding the spinal cords of lab rats, and in months these lab rats are walking again.

This is without stem cell research. This is without embryonic stem cell research. This is without therapeutic cloning.

What this article says is there are amazing breakthroughs in the tissues, the cells of our human bodies, without us going as far as some would have us go in playing with the recreation of human life just to take cells for research purposes. We do not have to go that far. The Weldon bill will say, stop this cloning business, just stop it, and use these remarkable breakthroughs, instead.

In fact, let me tell the Members what they did in one case, quickly. They used these cells taken from a pancreas that was diabetic, and then they grew insulin-producing islets inside that pancreas using these cells, not stem cells, but these cells that exist already in the body.

Mr. Speaker, there are ways for us to get these answers without messing with cloning. These cells are human beings. We ought to pass this bill today.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO).

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to read a list of people who are interested in this bill, more for the people who may be watching this than for the people in this room. Most of us know who is on which side.

The Juvenile Diabetes Foundation, the American Association of Medical Colleges, the Alliance for Aging Research, the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, the American Academy of Optometry, the American Association of Cancer Research, the American Association of Anatomists, and on and on and on.

Most of these organizations, all of these organizations, are populated by people who, for the most part, are much more knowledgeable about the details than any of us.

I know there are many people on this floor today who know more about this issue on specifics than I do, and I respect that; but it is really not about the details, it is really about the future. That is what it is all about.

I cannot, and most of us are totally incapable of knowing everything we want to know about science, especially in the short period of time we have to learn it. But when I see a list of people like this, all of whom want to continue research unfettered by government, many of whom are not engaged in stem cell research; they may be at some future point, but many of them are not. Most genetic research right now is not related to stem cell research, not yet. It may never be. Stem cells is just another potential. That is all it is at the moment.

For us to sit here today and tell the scientists of America, and particularly the scientists of the world, because it will not stop, it will simply move offshore, that this Congress, most of whom are generalists on different areas or specialists in other areas, that this Congress is going to tell them stop, really puts us in the exact same position as legislators and clergy in the Middle Ages when they said, Do not do autopsies. It is immoral; it is unethical. We do not like it. Do not cut those bodies open. Yet men and women did it, to our great benefit today.

It is an old story; it is not a new story. It is not just isolated; it has happened throughout the ages. Not very long ago, in my lifetime, we had people in this country who said, The polio vaccine might cause trouble because it is really dead polio stuff. Yet in my family we lost a young girl to polio, and we saved my brother based on research that some people in those days condemned.

X-rays, we take them as common today. There were many people when x-rays were first invented who said, Oh, my God, we cannot do that. It was not meant for man to see through someone's body. We do it today with impunity. These same issues are arising again today. We should not sub-

stitute our general opinion that we are not even sure about for the future of science and for the health of our children and grandchildren.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE).

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into a colloquy with my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON).

I would ask the gentleman to correct me if I am wrong, but it seems to me the gentleman's bill makes illegal the creation of a blastocyst for either reproductive or therapeutic cloning. Is that correct?

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GANSKE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. I would say to the gentleman, yes, that is correct.

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman another question. I wrote an op ed piece that said, "Let me make my position absolutely clear. I oppose the cloning of human beings. I favor Federal funding of stem cell research. The potential this research has to cure disease and alleviate human suffering leads me to believe this is a pro-life position."

My question to the gentleman from Florida is this: What about those fertilized eggs that are not created for research purposes, that are in fertility clinics that are not being used? Does the gentleman's bill make it illegal to use those blastocysts for stem cell research?

Mr. WELDON of Florida. If the gentleman will yield further, no, it does not.

Mr. GANSKE. I thank the gentleman. I want to be absolutely clear on this.

I ask the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON), does he think one can be consistent in being for Federal funding for stem cell research and also being in favor of the gentleman's bill?

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Yes.

□ 1400

Mr. GANSKE. And would the gentleman say that the reason for that is that his bill is focusing primarily on the initial creation of this blastocyst or the equivalent of a fertilized egg and the problems that that would have because we would be basically creating an embryo for research?

Mr. WELDON of Florida. If the gentleman would continue to yield, yes, the threshold we are being asked to cross is no longer just using the embryos that are in the IVF clinics but actually creating embryos for destructive research service.

Mr. GANSKE. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I believe there are ethical considerations that enter to the creation of an embryo for research pur-

poses, and that is why I will support the Weldon bill. And I will vote against the Greenwood substitute, and I thank the gentleman.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH).

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time, and I am going to use this time really to respond to some of the statements that my colleagues have made in support of the Weldon bill as recently as the last speaker.

Let me again really focus this debate so Members know exactly what they are voting on. It has been presented that the Weldon bill does not stop stem cell research. Well, I do not believe that is true, and I think the facts bear out that that is not true.

This issue is intricately intertwined with stem cell research, and Members need to understand that is what we are voting on. Because just like organ transplants, the organs that can be transplanted have no use if the body is going to reject them. And what I want each of us as Members to think about, and I think my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD), did this as well as I have heard anyone ever do on this floor, think about some of the most awful stories of the human condition, of real people, and each of us have heard these stories, whether on a personal basis or whether as a Member of Congress.

I have the numbers here: 24 million people with diabetes, 15 million with cancer, 6 million with Alzheimer's, 1 million people with Parkinson's. Those are obviously large numbers. But I ask each of my colleagues to think of one person, maybe a grandmother or a grandfather, a father, a mother, a friend who had one of these diseases. And what we would be doing today if we passed the Weldon bill would be taking away their hope of stopping their pain and their suffering. That is the choice in front of us. That truly is the choice in front of us.

We do not have that cure yet. But we all know, all of us have heard and read the specifics of where the research is, and it is there. It might not be there tomorrow, but it is there. We would stop all this research. All of it. All of it. Not Federal funding, but all of it. Private funding, Federal funding. Criminalize it, and all of this research would stop under the Weldon bill.

And let us kind of weigh what we have here. Let us weigh what we have. We have the potentiality in terms of the human condition that I think is as monumental as anything we can possibly contemplate. Again, we can talk about tens of millions and hundreds of millions, but I ask each of my colleagues to focus on one, someone who they know. But then what are we weighing that against? We are weighing that against stopping somatic cell

nuclear transfer. That is what it is, somatic cell nuclear transfer. It is not an embryo. It is not the creation of life.

There are issues, and I think very serious ethical, moral issues, about using embryos for stem cell research, and we can talk about them. And I think we take this issue seriously. I think all Members take it seriously. We do not take it lightly at all. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD), I think, spoke as well as I have ever heard anyone speak about this on this floor, that by any concept of what we have talked about, a sperm and an egg joining for the potentiality of the creation of a unique human being. That is not what somatic cell nuclear transfer is about.

Somatic cell nuclear transfer is the taking an egg that is not fertilized, taking out the 23 chromosomes and literally, literally taking one of the several trillion, several trillion cells in a body, whether it is the gentleman from Pennsylvania's cheek cell, one of the several trillion, or the cell on his skin or another cell, a cell of several trillion in a person's body, taking that one cell and taking out the 46 chromosomes and putting it in this egg.

And why are we doing it? Again, there is not a Member in this Chamber that wants to allow it to be done for the potentiality of creating a human being. Absolutely not. Illegal under both bills. But what we do want is the potentiality of literally saving tens of millions of lives with that. That reality is there. And if we pass the Weldon bill, we prevent that.

We will not prevent it in some other countries, but what we do, as amazing as it sounds, is we prevent that research from coming into the United States. Which again, as I said previously, I cannot conceive that one of my colleagues in this Chamber would ever have the ability to look a family member or any person, for that matter, in the eye, a quadriplegic, someone suffering from Parkinson's, and say they could not take the benefit of the research.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the defeat of the rule.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to remind my colleagues that everybody who came before the Committee on Rules with any kind of an amendment got their amendment, so I urge them not to defeat the rule. Yes, this is a complex issue; but we need to have a substantive debate on it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FERGUSON).

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of the rule on House Resolution 2505, the Human Cloning Prohibition Act. It is a good and fair rule, and it allows for a full debate on this important issue at hand.

In light of recent scientific advances in genetic research, our society is faced

with some difficult decisions, foremost among these is what value we place on human life. At first glance, human cloning appears to respect life because it mimics the creation of life. However, when we look closely at the manner in which this life is created, in a laboratory, and for what purpose, out of utility, one cannot help but see that cloning is actually the degradation of human life to a scientific curiosity.

Designing a life to serve our curiosity, timing its creation to fit our schedules, manipulating its genetic makeup to suit our desires, is the treatment of life as an object, not as an individual with its own identity and rights.

H.R. 2505, the Human Cloning Prohibition Act is a brave step in the right direction. This legislation amends U.S. law to ban human cloning by prohibiting the use of somatic cell nuclear transfer techniques to create human embryos. This act bans reproductive cloning and so-called therapeutic cloning.

Therapeutic cloning, as my colleagues know, is performed solely for the purpose of research. There is no intention in this process to allow the living organism to survive. While this bill does not restrict the use of cloning technology to produce DNA, cells other than human embryos, tissue or organs, it makes it unlawful for any person or entity, public or private, to perform cloning or to transport, receive, or import the results of such a procedure.

As my colleagues know, the high risk of failure, even in the most advanced cloning technologies, gives us pause. Even the so-called successful clones are highly likely to suffer crippling deformities and abnormalities after birth. Again, the push for scientific knowledge must not supercede our basic belief that human life is sacred.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join the majority of Americans in support of this rule, to oppose the Greenwood substitute, and to support the carefully crafted bill of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) to prevent human cloning and to keep us from going down this dangerous road.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. I include for the RECORD two articles that outline the research by Johns Hopkins University about the cure of paralysis that was reported last week at the annual meeting of the Society for Neuroscience in New Orleans.

[From the Yale Bulletin & Calendar, Dec. 1, 2000]

TEAM USES PRIMATE'S OWN CELLS TO REPAIR SPINAL CORD INJURY

(By Jacqueline Weaver)

A Yale research team has transplanted stem cells from a primate to repair the protective sheath around the spinal cord in the

same animal, an accomplishment that some day could help people with spinal cord injuries and multiple sclerosis.

"The concept is not ready for people, but the fact that it can be achieved in a primate is significant," says Jeffrey Kocsis, professor of neurology and neurobiology at the School of Medicine. "Cells were taken from the same animal, with minimal neurological damage, and then injected to rebuild the myelin."

In multiple sclerosis, the immune system goes awry and attacks the myelin. Damage to the myelin builds up over years, causing muscle weakness or paralysis, fatigue, dim or blurred vision and memory loss.

Using the primate's own cells to repair the myelin, which is a fatty sheath that surrounds and insulates some nerve cells, sidesteps a common problem in transplanting organs, explains the researcher. Patients generally have to take drugs to suppress their immune systems so that their bodies do not reject an organ obtained from a donor.

"We didn't even need to immunosuppress the primate," says Kocsis, who presented his findings last week at the annual meeting of the Society for Neuroscience in New Orleans.

The experiment involved collecting small amounts of tissue from the subventricular area of the primate brain using ultrasonography. The neural precursor cells, or stem cells, then were isolated and expanded in vitro using mitogen, an agent that promotes cell division.

At the same time, myelin was removed from the primate's spinal cord. The stem cells were then injected in the same spot to form new myelin to cover the nerve fibers.

"The lesions were examined three weeks after transplantation and we found the demyelinated axons were remyelinated," Kocsis says. "These results demonstrate that autologous transplantation of neural precursor cells in the adult non-human primate can remyelinate demyelinated axons, thus suggesting the potential utility of such an approach in remyelinating lesions in humans."

[From the Times (London), July 26, 2001]  
STEM CELL INJECTION HELPS MICE TO WALK AGAIN AS SCIENTISTS FIGHT FOR FUNDING  
(Katty Kay in Washington and Mark Henderson, Science Correspondent)

A video showing mice that have been partially cured of paralysis by injections of human stem cells was released last night by American scientists. They are seeking to head off a ban on government funding of similar research.

Researchers at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore broke with standard scientific practice to screen the tape before details of their research have been formally published, in the hope that it will convince President Bush of the value of stem cell technology.

The U.S. Government is considering whether to outlaw all federal funding of studies using stem cells taken from human embryos, which promise to provide new treatments for many conditions, including paralysis and Parkinson's disease.

Opponents argue that the research is immoral as the cells are taken from viable human embryos. President Bush has suspended federal funding of such work and has announced a review of its future. He was urged this week by the Pope to outlaw the practice.

John Gearhart and Douglas Kerr, who led the privately funded research, hope that the tape will have a decisive impact on the debate by showing the potential of the technique. It shows mice paralyzed by motor

neuron disease once again able to move their limbs, bear their own weight and even more around after injections of human embryonic stem cells in their spinal cords.

Dr. Kerr said that the team hopes to start human clinical trials within three years but that a federal funding ban would deal a "potentially fatal blow" to its efforts.

Details of its research were first revealed in November last year, though it has yet to be published in a peer-reviewed journal. In this case, however, the team took the decision to show the tape to Tommy Thompson, the U.S. Health and Human Services Secretary, who is conducting a review of stem cell funding for President Bush, and to Pete Domenici, a Republican senator. It is now to be released to the public as well.

Medical research charities said the video would have a major impact. "I wish the President would see this tape," said Michael Manganiello, vice-president of the Christopher Reeve Paralysis Foundation, named after the Superman actor who was paralyzed in a riding accident.

"When you see a rat going from dragging his hind legs to walking, it's not that big a leap to look at Christopher Reeve, and think how this might help him," he said.

In the experiment, 120 mice and rats were infected with a virus that caused spinal damage similar to that from motor neuron disease, the debilitating condition that affects Professor Stephen Hawking. The disease is generally incurable and sufferers usually die from it within two to six years.

When fluid containing human embryonic stem cells was infused into the spinal fluid of the paralyzed rodents, every one of the animals regained at least some movement. In previous tests stem cells have been transplanted directly into the spinal cord. Infusing the fluid is far less invasive and would make eventual treatment in humans much easier.

Dr. Kerr said the limited movement seen was a reflection of the limited research, not of the limits to stem cells themselves.

"I would be a fool to say that the ceiling we have now is the same ceiling we'll see in two years," he said. "We will be smarter and the stem cell research even more developed."

However, the prospect of human trials in three years depends on the outcome of a political and ethical debate over whether the US Government will allow federal funding for stem cell research. If President Bush decides not to approve government funds for research, that would set the timetable back 10 to 12 years for tests in humans, Dr. Kerr said.

The controversy stems from the fact that human embryos must be destroyed in order to retrieve the stem cells. Mr. Bush is under pressure from conservative Republicans and Roman Catholics not to back the research on moral grounds.

Some top American scientists, who are becoming increasingly frustrated with the funding limitations, have left for Britain where government funding is available. The British Government has approved stem cell research on the ground that it could help to cure intractable disease.

The research on rodents at Johns Hopkins took stem cells from five to nine-week-old human fetuses that had been electively aborted.

#### THERAPIES

There is no cure for ALS, and more research needs to be done in order for there to be one.

Currently, there is only one drug on the market that has been approved by the FDA

for the treatment of ALS: Riluzole. It was originally developed as an anti-convulsant, but it has also been shown to have anti-glutamate effects. In a French trial, it was found that those taking the drug had an enhanced survival rate of 74% as compared to only 58% in the placebo group. [1] But, the drug has gotten mixed reviews, with divergent results occurring throughout the trials.

Creatine has also been shown to help motor neurons produce needed energy for longer survival and is currently being tested in clinical ALS trials. Creatine is an over-the-counter supplement that is popular as a muscle builder among athletes. Creatine is a natural body substance involved in the transport of energy. Studies using SOD1 mice found that animals given a diet high in creatine had the same amount of healthy muscle-controlling nerve cells as mice in the normal, or control, group. Creatine can be found in a variety of health food stores.

Sanofi, still in clinical trial, is a nonpeptide compound which possesses neurotrophin-like activity at nanomolar concentrations in vitro, and after administration of low oral doses in vivo. The compound reduces the histological, neurochemical and functional deficits produced in widely divergent models of experimental neurodegeneration. The ability of sanofi to increase the innervation of human muscle by spinal cord explants and to prolong the survival of mice suffering from progressive motor neuronopathy suggest the compound might be an effective therapy for the treatment of ALS.

The mechanism by which sanofi elicits its neurotrophic and neuroprotective effects, although not fully elucidated, is probably related to the compound's ability to mimic the activity of, or stimulate the biosynthesis of, a number of endogenous neurotrophins such as nerve growth factor (NGF) and brain-derived neurotrophic factor (BDNF). While sanofi has high affinity for serotonin 5-HT1A receptors and some affinity for sigma sites, its affinity for these targets appears to be unrelated to its neurotrophic or neuroprotective activity.

#### STEM CELL THERAPY

Therapeutic efforts are underway to prevent diseases or prevent their progress, but more is going to be needed in order to repair the damage that has been done in ALS. Neurons are dead and muscles have atrophied; these must be regenerated to get back what has been lost. Stem cell therapy is going to be key.

The definition of a stem cell is under debate, but most researchers agree with the properties of multipotency, high proliferative potential and self-renewal.[2]

Embryonic and fetal stem cells differ in their isolation periods, and thus their potentials. Embryonic stem cells are derived very early in development, either at or before the blastocyst stage, and are defined as pluripotent, with the ability to differentiate into multiple cell types. When a sperm fertilizes an egg, that cell will then go on to further divide and differentiate into cells that will make up the entire body. If cells are captured before they differentiate, those cells then have the ability to become many types of desired cells. Fetal stem cells, which can be isolated at a later stage (from aborted fetuses, for example), are more differentiated and thus more restricted in the lineage they can become. Research has shown that the beauty of the embryonic stem cell is in its ability to become all types of cells, migrate, and respond to cues in the transplanted environment.

Adult stem cells can be isolated from certain areas in the adult body, including neurogenic areas of the brain (the dentate gyrus and olfactory bulb), and bone marrow. Recent research has shown bone marrow derived stem cells are very versatile, differentiating into muscle, blood, and neural cell fates. [3] While adult stem cells hold promising hope, they are not abundant, are difficult to isolate and propagate, and may decline with increasing age. Some evidence suggests that they may not have the differential potential and migratory ability as embryonic stem cells. Also, there is concern that adult stem cells may harbor more DNA mutations, since free radical damage and declination of DNA repair systems are known to occur more with age. [4] Any attempt to treat patients with their own stem cells, which from an immunologic standpoint would be great, would require those stem cells to be isolated and grown in culture to promote sufficient numbers. For many patients, including ALS patients, there may not be enough time to do this. For other diseases, such as those caused by genetic defects, it might not be wise to use one's own cells since that genetic defect is likely to be in those cells as well. Adult stem cells are less controversial, due to no isolation from embryonic or fetal tissue, but they may not have the same therapeutic potential.

Dr. Evan Snyder and his lab at the Boston Children's Hospital have transplanted embryonic mouse stem cells (C17.2) into the spinal cords of onset SOD1 mice. These cells were found to integrate into the system, with some found to have differentiated into immature neurons. Rotorod analysis, which measures functional behavior, indicated that those animals that had received a transplant, had improved functional recovery as compared to those that had not received cells. (This data is in press and will be presented at the Neuroscience Conference in San Diego, Fall 2001.)

Dr. Snyder and his team are also involved in embryonic stem cell transplant in primate models that resemble ALS. This is exciting work that may help push stem cell therapy to clinical trial. This research is being funded by Project A.L.S. (go to [www.projectals.org](http://www.projectals.org))

Recently, it was reported that researchers at Johns Hopkins had made an exciting finding with stem cell therapy in regards to ALS. The following report is taken directly from the Johns Hopkins press.

#### STEM CELLS GRAFT IN SPINAL CORD, RESTORE MOVEMENT IN PARALYZED MICE

Scientists at Johns Hopkins report they've restored movement to newly paralyzed rodents by injecting stem cells into the animals' spinal fluid. Results of their study were presented in the annual meeting of The Society of Neuroscience in New Orleans.

The researchers introduced neural stem cells into the spinal fluid of mice and rats paralyzed by an animal virus that specifically attacks motor neurons. Normally, animals infected with Sindbis virus permanently lose the ability to move their limbs, as neurons leading from the spinal cord to muscles deteriorate. They drag legs and feet behind them.

Fifty percent of the stem-cell treated rodents, however, recovered the ability to place the soles of one or both of their hind feet on the ground. "This research may lead most immediately to improved treatments for patients with paralyzing motor neuron disease, such as amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS) and another disorder, spinal motor atrophy (SMA)," says researcher Jeffrey Rothstein, M.D., Ph.D.

"Under the best research circumstances," he adds, "stem cells could be used in early clinical trials within two years."

"The study is significant because it's one of the first examples where stem cells may restore function over a broad region of the central nervous system," says neurologist Douglas Kerr, M.S., Ph.D., who led the research team. "Most use of neural stem cells so far has been for focused problems such as stroke damage or Parkinson's disease, which affect a small, specific area," Kerr explains.

In the rodent study, however, injected stem cells migrated to broadly damaged areas of the spinal cord. "something about cell death is apparently a potent stimulus for stem cell migration," says Kerr. "Add these cells to a normal rat or mouse, and nothing migrates to the spinal cord." In the study of 18 rodents, the researchers injected stem cells into the animals' cerebrospinal fluid via a hollow needle at the base of the spinal cord—like a spinal tap in reverse. Within several weeks, the cells migrated to the ventral horn, a region of the spinal cord containing the bodies of motor nerve cells.

"After 8 weeks, we saw a definite functional improvement in half of the mice and rats," says Kerr. "From 5 to 7 percent of the stem cells that migrated to the spinal cord appeared to differentiate into nerve cells," he says. "They expressed mature neuronal markers on their cell surfaces. Now we're working to explain how such an apparently small number of nerve cells can make such a relatively large improvement in function."

"It could be that fewer nerve cells are needed for function than we suspect. The other explanation is that the stem cells themselves haven't restored the nerve cell-to-muscle units required for movement but that, instead, they protect or stimulate the few undamaged nerve cells that still remain. We're pursuing this question now in the lab."

The rodents infected with the Sindbis virus are a tested model for SMA, Kerr noted. SMA is the most common inherited neurological disorder and the most common inherited cause of infant death, affecting between 1 in 6,000 and 1 in 20,000 infants. In the disease, nerve cells leading from the spinal cord to muscles deteriorate. Children are born weak and have trouble swallowing, breathing and walking, most die in infancy, though some live into young childhood.

With ALS, which affects as many as 20,000 in this country, motor nerves leading from the brain to the spinal cord as well as those from the cord to muscles deteriorate. The disease eventually creates whole-body paralysis and death.

The research was funded by grants from the Muscular Dystrophy Association and Project ALS.

Other scientists were Nicholas Maragakis, M.D., John D. Gearhart, Ph.D., of Hopkins, and Evan Snyder, at Harvard.

Stem cell therapy offers much promise to people suffering with ALS, as well as many other diseases, including Parkinson's and Alzheimer's. The key to this work is going to be support and funding. So many people will die without it.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] 1999. Nerve Preserver. *Prevention* 47.
- [2] Temple, S. & Alvarez-Buylla, A. 1999. Stem cells in the Adult Mammalian Central Nervous System. *Current Opinion in Neurobiology*, 9:135-41.
- [3] Mezey, E. Chandross, K. 2000. Bone marrow: a possible alternative source of cells in the adult nervous system. *European Journal of Pharmacology* 405:297-302.

[4] Kirkwood, T., Austad, S. 2000. Why do we age? *Nature* 408:233-38.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). The gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) has 2 minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) has 6 minutes remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire if the gentlewoman from North Carolina has more speakers?

Mrs. MYRICK. Yes, I do. I have several more speakers.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. KERNS).

Mr. KERNS. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today to urge my colleagues' support of the rule and H.R. 2505, the Human Cloning Act of 2001.

Today we take an important step in the process to ban human cloning in the United States. With technologies advancing rapidly, the race to clone a human being has become all too real. Simply put, H.R. 2505 will ban the process of cloning another human being. It will not, however, prohibit scientists from conducting responsible research.

Human cloning is not a Republican issue or a Democrat issue, it is an issue for all of mankind. The prospect of cloning a human being raises serious moral, ethical, and human health implications. As countries around the globe look to the United States for leadership, it is our responsibility to take a firm position and ban human cloning.

I spent, recently, many days traveling all throughout Indiana talking to people about this issue; and I have received lots of calls from across the country about this issue. I believe overwhelmingly that the people of this country want to ban human cloning.

There are several important factors my colleagues should be aware of when considering this legislation. H.R. 2550 does not restrict the practice of in vitro fertilization. It does not deal with the separate issue of whether the Federal Government should fund stem cell research on human embryos. Furthermore, 2505 does not prohibit the use of cloning methods to produce any molecules, DNA, organs, plants, or animals other than humans.

I urge all my colleagues to vote in support of the rule today.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule and the anti-cloning bill authored by my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON). The House of Representatives must choose today

whom it will serve, whether it will support the Weldon cloning ban and protect nascent human life or whether it will endorse an alternative that will most certainly lead to the creation of a subclass of human life solely for the purpose of experimentation and destruction.

Mr. Speaker, no ethical case can be made for cloning a human being. The Weldon bill bans all human cloning. The alternative before us would allow cloning as long as the cloned human is destroyed before it can follow the natural progression of life.

Today, Mr. Speaker, this Congress has the ability to settle some of the moral confusion of our time, to say that humanity will master rather than be mastered by science. Humanity is once again on the verge of a great moral decision. I pray we will not fall into the same type of tragic reasoning that has led previous generations into slavery and genocide through the devaluation of human life.

Let us reject the notion that exploitation of life is acceptable. This institution must respect life, protect life, and choose life; and I stand in strong support of the rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and H.R. 2505.

This bill prohibits cloning of human beings, and it also prohibits another type of cloning which seriously endangers the sanctity of human life, the so-called therapeutic cloning. In this process, scientists would create embryos solely to experiment on them and eventually to destroy them for stem cells or whatever purpose. Remember, however, that the purpose is to destroy them.

Every argument in favor of therapeutic cloning assumes that the smallest human lives, embryos typically days old, are not lives at all. They are just clumps of cells to be manipulated and used for the benefit of those who have already been born. No matter how good the intention, this type of scientific rationalization endangers the very fabric of our society, our respect for ourselves and others. Nothing, I believe, can justify the taking of human life to improve the quality of another.

□ 1415

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill, a true ban on human cloning.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to just comment, it was said a while ago that all the amendments that were brought

up on this piece of legislation were allowed. Three were rejected by the Committee on Rules. One was by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), which made sure that this did not have anything to do with in vitro fertilization that was not allowed. Two were by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), which would have also protected the rights of human beings.

I want to say to all my colleagues, because all of us have said it over and over again, that we are all opposed to the cloning of human beings. I believe this House is already on record having said that. But a lot of us believe that science is important, that taking care of the human beings who live here, to provide better health, a chance to live, a hope that paraplegics will walk, that diabetes will be done away with, that cancer can be found a cure for, all the promises that stem cells hold.

I want to say the same thing that my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO) said. I recall the first debate when the first organ transplants took place, that that perhaps is not God's will. Maybe God expects us to help ourselves and to take advantage of the things he has given us here on Earth, to learn to do better and to do better for our fellow human beings.

Underlying all of this, Mr. Speaker, is that this House is in no way ready to debate this measure. There simply is not enough knowledge on either side. People are not clear on what is happening here. I am absolutely certain, as are many Members in this House, that this does away with stem cell research despite the fact that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) believes it does not. There are far too many of us that believe that it does.

There are far too many questions left unanswered. The underlying case is, is the United States going to turn its back on science, and let other countries do it and then prohibit, with this legislation, the ability for us to even take advantage of breakthroughs, if they occur in another country, because we cannot import the cure?

What a terrible thought that must be for people out there who are waiting on a daily basis for something wonderful to happen to save the life of someone who means the world to them, for people who sit by a child's bedside and for people who pray every day for some deliverance from some awful scourge. I think they expect from us to know what we are doing here today.

I urge with all my heart a no vote on this rule to give us time in this House to really understand what we are doing because of the far-reaching implications of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). The time of the gentlewoman from New York has expired.

The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 2½ minutes remaining and has the right to close.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to clarify a remark based on what the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) said. I said that the amendments of everybody who came before the Committee on Rules, who came to testify, were accepted. The other amendments were rejected in the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, let me in closing just say I think this is a very fair and equitable rule. We allowed the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) a full hour to debate the merits of his issue. I believe we will get a full airing of the essential debate.

I think the essential debate is, do we want to take the next step on this embryo stem cell issue, and take the Nation to the place where we are going to be creating embryos, no longer using so-called excess embryos, but we are going to start creating embryos.

I am a physician. I saw patients just last week. I have treated patients with Alzheimer's disease, Lou Gehrig's disease, diabetes. My father had diabetes. To hold out reproductive cloning as a solution to these problems is pie in the sky. It does not even exist.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELDON of Florida. I only have 2 minutes.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. We are not talking about reproductive cloning.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. I will not yield.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will suspend. The gentleman from Florida has the time.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would be very pleased to discuss the issue of reproductive cloning. It does not exist. It is a theoretical construct.

I was just on the phone with a physician colleague from Chicago last night, who spoke to the world's most eminent embryologist at Stanford University, and I am quoting from him when he says, "It is pie in the sky."

One other thing I just want to clarify: My colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH), said the somatic cell nuclear transfer creating a cloned embryo is not the creation of life. I think to put forward that notion is totally absurd. That is like saying Dolly is not alive.

We are talking about creating human embryos for destructive research purposes, creating them. We are not talking about using the embryos in the IVF clinics anymore, in the freezers, the so-called excess embryos; we are talking about creating them for research pur-

poses. I believe that is a line we do not want to cross.

We will have that debate in a little while. I encourage everyone to vote yes on this rule.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this rule so we can go ahead and have this debate, and discuss this complex and substantive issue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on House Resolution 214 will be followed by a 5-minute vote on H.R. 2540.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 239, nays 188, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 300]

YEAS—239

Aderholt	DeLay	Hoekstra
Akin	DeMint	Holden
Armey	Diaz-Balart	Hostettler
Bachus	Doolittle	Houghton
Baker	Doyle	Hulshof
Ballenger	Dreier	Hunter
Barcia	Duncan	Hyde
Barr	Dunn	Isakson
Bartlett	Ehlers	Issa
Barton	Ehrlich	Istook
Bereuter	Emerson	Jenkins
Berry	English	John
Biggert	Everett	Johnson (IL)
Bilirakis	Ferguson	Johnson, Sam
Blunt	Flake	Jones (NC)
Boehert	Fletcher	Keller
Boehner	Foley	Kelly
Bonilla	Forbes	Kennedy (MN)
Brady (TX)	Fossella	Kerns
Brown (SC)	Frelinghuysen	Kildee
Bryant	Galleghy	King (NY)
Burr	Ganske	Kingston
Burton	Gekas	Kirk
Buyer	Gibbons	Knollenberg
Callahan	Gilchrest	Kucinich
Calvert	Gillmor	Langevin
Camp	Goode	Largent
Cannon	Goodlatte	Latham
Cantor	Goss	LaTourette
Capito	Graham	Leach
Carson (OK)	Graves	Lewis (CA)
Chabot	Green (WI)	Lewis (KY)
Chambliss	Greenwood	Linder
Coble	Grucci	LoBiondo
Collins	Gutknecht	Lucas (KY)
Combest	Hall (OH)	Lucas (OK)
Cooksey	Hall (TX)	Manzullo
Costello	Hansen	Mascara
Cox	Hart	Matheson
Crane	Hastert	McCarthy (NY)
Crenshaw	Hastings (WA)	McCrery
Cubin	Hayes	McHugh
Culberson	Hayworth	McInnis
Cunningham	Hefley	McIntyre
Davis, Jo Ann	Herger	McKeon
Davis, Tom	Hilleary	McNulty
Deal	Hobson	Mica

Miller, Gary  
Mollohan  
Moran (KS)  
Morella  
Myrick  
Nethercutt  
Ney  
Northup  
Norwood  
Nussle  
Oberstar  
Ortiz  
Osborne  
Ose  
Otter  
Oxley  
Paul  
Pence  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Phelps  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Platts  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Portman  
Pryce (OH)  
Putnam  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Rahall

Regula  
Rehberg  
Reynolds  
Riley  
Roemer  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Ryan (WI)  
Ryun (KS)  
Saxton  
Scarborough  
Schaffer  
Schrock  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Sherwood  
Shimkus  
Shows  
Shuster  
Simmons  
Simpson  
Skeen  
Skelton  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Souder  
Stearns  
Stenholm  
Stump

NAYS—188

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Allen  
Andrews  
Baca  
Baird  
Baldacci  
Baldwin  
Barrett  
Bass  
Becerra  
Bentsen  
Berkley  
Berman  
Bishop  
Blagojevich  
Blumenauer  
Bonior  
Bono  
Borski  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boyd  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brown (OH)  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardin  
Carson (IN)  
Castle  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clement  
Clyburn  
Condit  
Conyers  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Crowley  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (FL)  
Davis (IL)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
Deutsch  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Dooley  
Edwards  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Evans  
Farr  
Fattah

Filner  
Ford  
Frank  
Frost  
Gephardt  
Gilman  
Gonzalez  
Gordon  
Granger  
Green (TX)  
Gutierrez  
Harman  
Hill  
Hilliard  
Hinchev  
Hinojosa  
Hoeffel  
Holt  
Honda  
Hooley  
Horn  
Hoyer  
Inslee  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kilpatrick  
Kind (WI)  
Kleczka  
Kolbe  
LaFalce  
Lampson  
Lantos  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lofgren  
Lowey  
Luther  
Maloney (CT)  
Maloney (NY)  
Markey  
Matsui  
McCarthy (MO)  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McKinney  
Meehan  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)

Menendez  
Millender-  
McDonald  
Miller (FL)  
Miller, George  
Mink  
Moore  
Moran (VA)  
Murtha  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Obey  
Olver  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Price (NC)  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Reyes  
Rivers  
Rodriguez  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roukema  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Rush  
Sabo  
Sanchez  
Sanders  
Sandlin  
Sawyer  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Scott  
Serrano  
Shaw  
Shays  
Sherman  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Solis  
Spratt  
Strickland  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thurman  
Tierney  
Towns  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Upton

Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Waters  
Watson (CA)

Watt (NC)  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Wexler

Hastings (FL)  
Hutchinson  
Jones (OH)

NOT VOTING—7

LaHood  
Lipinski  
Spence

□ 1442

Ms. BALDWIN and Mr. PASTOR changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California and Mr. RADANOVICH changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERANS BENEFITS ACT OF 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 2540, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2540, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 422, nays 0, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 301]

YEAS—422

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Allen  
Andrews  
Armey  
Baca  
Bachus  
Baird  
Baker  
Baldaacci  
Baldwin  
Ballenger  
Barcia  
Barr  
Barrett  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bass  
Becerra  
Bentsen  
Bereuter  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Biggart  
Bilirakis  
Bishop  
Blagojevich  
Blumenauer  
Blunt  
Boehert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bonior  
Bono  
Borski  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boyd  
Brady (PA)

Brady (TX)  
Brown (FL)  
Brown (OH)  
Brown (SC)  
Bryant  
Burr  
Burton  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Camp  
Cannon  
Cantor  
Capito  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardin  
Carson (IN)  
Carson (OK)  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chambliss  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clement  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Collins  
Combest  
Condit  
Conyers  
Cooksey  
Costello  
Cox  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Crane  
Crenshaw  
Crowley  
Cubin  
Culberson  
Cummings

Cunningham  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (FL)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis, Jo Ann  
Davis, Tom  
Deal  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
DeLay  
DeMint  
Deutsch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Dooley  
Doolittle  
Doyle  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Edwards  
Ehlers  
Ehrlich  
Emerson  
Engel  
English  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Evans  
Everett  
Farr  
Fattah  
Ferguson  
Filner  
Flake  
Fletcher  
Foley  
Forbes

Ford  
Fossella  
Frank  
Frelinghuysen  
Frost  
Gallegly  
Ganske  
Gekas  
Gephardt  
Gibbons  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Gonzalez  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Goss  
Graham  
Granger  
Graves  
Green (TX)  
Green (WI)  
Greenwood  
Grucci  
Gutierrez  
Gutknecht  
Hall (OH)  
Hall (TX)  
Hansen  
Harman  
Hart  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Herger  
Hill  
Hilleary  
Hilliard  
Hinchev  
Hinojosa  
Hobson  
Hoeffel  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hooley  
Horn  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hoyer  
Hulshof  
Hunter  
Hyde  
Inslee  
Isakson  
Israel  
Issa  
Istook  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson  
Jenkins  
John  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones (NC)  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Keller  
Kelly  
Kennedy (MN)  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kerns  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kind (WI)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kirk  
Kleczka  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
Kucinich  
LaFalce  
LaHood  
Lampson  
Langevin  
Lantos  
Largent  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)

Latham  
LaTourette  
Leach  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
LoBiondo  
Lofgren  
Lowey  
Lucas (KY)  
Lucas (OK)  
Luther  
Maloney (CT)  
Maloney (NY)  
Manzullo  
Markey  
Mascara  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (MO)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McCrery  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Menendez  
Mica  
Millender-  
McDonald  
Miller (FL)  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Mink  
Mollohan  
Moore  
Moran (KS)  
Moran (VA)  
Morella  
Murtha  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Nethercutt  
Ney  
Northup  
Norwood  
Nussle  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Osborne  
Ose  
Otter  
Oxley  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor  
Paul  
Pelosi  
Pence  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Phelps  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Platts  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Portman  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Putnam  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Reyes

Reynolds  
Rivers  
Rodriguez  
Roemer  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roukema  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Rush  
Ryan (WI)  
Sabo  
Sanchez  
Sanders  
Sandlin  
Sawyer  
Saxton  
Scarborough  
Schaffer  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schrock  
Scott  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Sherman  
Sherwood  
Shimkus  
Shows  
Shuster  
Simmons  
Simpson  
Skeen  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Solis  
Souder  
Spratt  
Stearns  
Stenholm  
Strickland  
Stump  
Stupak  
Sununu  
Sweeney  
Tancredo  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Terry  
Thomas  
Thompson (CA)  
Thornberry  
Thurman  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Toomey  
Towns  
Traficant  
Turner  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Upton