

INTRODUCTION OF THE VACCINES
FOR CHILDREN LEGISLATION**HON. JANE HARMAN**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 2001

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

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

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

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

HUMAN CLONING PROHIBITION
ACT OF 2001

SPEECH OF

HON. PETE SESSIONS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 31, 2001

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

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

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

CLONING'S BIG TEST

(By Leon R. Kass and Daniel Callahan)

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

The day of human cloning is near. Reputable physicians have announced plans to produce a cloned child within the year. One biotech company (Advanced Cell Technology) just announced its intention to start producing embryonic human clones for research purposes. Recognizing the urgent need for action, Congress is considering legislation that would ban human cloning. Last Tuesday the House Judiciary Committee approved a tough anti-cloning bill, H.R. 2505, the Human Cloning Prohibition Act of 2001. Introduced by Republican Dave Weldon of Florida and Democrat Bart Stupak of Michigan, and co-sponsored by more than 120 members from both parties, the bill is scheduled for a vote on the House floor as early as this week. But the House is also considering a much weaker "compromise" bill that would ban reproductive cloning but permit cloning for research. It is terribly important that the former, and not the latter, passes. First, because cloning is unethical, both in itself and in what it surely leads to. Second, because the Weldon-Stupak bill offers our best—indeed, our only—hope of preventing it from happening.

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

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

Here is why: Once cloned embryos exist, it will be virtually impossible to control what is done with them. Created in commercial laboratories, hidden from public view, stockpiles of cloned human embryos could be produced, bought, and sold without anyone knowing it. As we have seen with in vitro embryos created to treat infertility, embryos produced for one reason can be used for another: Today, "spare embryos" created to begin a pregnancy are used—by someone else—in research; and tomorrow, clones cre-

August 2, 2001

ated for research will be used—by someone else—to begin a pregnancy. Efforts at clonal baby-making (like all assisted reproduction) would take place within the privacy of a doctor-patient relationship, making outside scrutiny extremely difficult.

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

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

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

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

them. The Greenwood-Deutsch legislation reads less like the Cloning Prohibition Act of 2001 and more like the "Human Embryo Cloning Registration and Industry Protection Act of 2001."

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

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

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

SPEECH OF

HON. EVA M. CLAYTON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 30, 2001

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

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues an important issue affecting communities across the country, especially low-income communities with limited resources. Current Federal programs provide cleanup money for the worst sites. The Federal Government should help States provide funds for sites that have significant contamination but aren't the worst. Fed-

eral funding for redevelopment goes mainly to urban areas because private sector participation is more readily available. Rural and Environmental Justice communities have non-commercial needs. Environmental justice programs do not provide funding for cleanup.

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

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

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

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

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

EJ communities have many needs other than economic redevelopment.

Warren County is one of the poorest counties in North Carolina. The site of the detoxification and redevelopment project is rural and not suitable for commercial redevelopment. The county needs recreational and community facilities. They cannot obtain grants for these facilities until the site is cleaned up.

The Environmental Justice Program can not provide funds for the cleanup in Warren County, the birthplace of the environmental justice movement,

States have Voluntary Cleanup Programs. These programs have limited funds. In North Carolina, the program looks at sites that have serious problems but did not qualify for Superfund and provides oversight for there cleanup. Principal Responsible Parties are sought to participate. If they do not voluntarily participate the state may cleanup the site if funds are available.

Federal agencies other than EPA provide cleanup funds if their waste is part of a Superfund Cleanup; 10 percent of the material for the Warren County project came from Ft. Bragg and they have indicated that they will not participate.

The detoxification and redevelopment project in Warren County is not a part of North Carolina's voluntary cleanup program. However, the State of North Carolina has provided over \$10 million to date for the project. The estimated total cost is \$17.5 million. Based on this the state has provided over 50 percent of the funding rather than the 10 percent they would provide for a Superfund project.

NAGORNO-KARABAKH PEACE PROCESS

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 2001

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the following letter on Nagorno-Karabakh Peace Process:

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 4, 2001.

Hon. COLIN POWELL,
Secretary of State, Department of State,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY POWELL: I would like to extend my congratulations to you on your appointment earlier this year as our nation's new Secretary of State. Your expertise in international affairs and your prestige among world leaders will undoubtedly serve as an asset to the office and our country.

As a representative of the largest Armenian community outside of Armenia, I am very interested in the recent developments in the Nagorno-Karabakh peace process, as well as U.S. recognition of the Armenian Genocide, and the economic well being of the Republic of Armenia.

Your personal attendance at the talks on Nagorno-Karabakh in Key West, Florida is an indication of the Administration's interest in the region.

I fully agree with your statement expressing our country's commitment to facilitating a mutually acceptable settlement of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict. While a lasting peace will serve as a stabilizing force in the Caucasus, I sincerely hope that the history of this region will be an important factor in determining outcomes.

In his attempt to fortify his iron grip over a multiethnic and multicultural society that was the Soviet Union, Joseph Stalin redrew the map of the region to weaken the indigenous populations by carving up ethnically homogeneous republics into unrecognizable autonomous and semi-autonomous regions, such as Nagorno-Karabakh, Nakhichevan and Javakh, all historically Armenian.

The Nagorno-Karabakh peace talks may be our opportunity to correct one of the many historical injustices committed by Stalin.

As a member of the House International Relations Committee, I would greatly appreciate an opportunity to meet with you in the near future to discuss the Administration's policy vis-a-vis the Caucasus. I look forward to hearing from your office regarding a meeting and look forward to working with you on foreign policy issues in the years to come.

Sincerely,

ADAM B. SCHIFF,
Member of Congress.

WORLD CONFERENCE ON RACISM

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 2001

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as we speak an intensive two week effort is underway in Geneva to finalize plans for the World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance.

The World Conference, to be held in Durban, South Africa on August 31st, is expected