

use of which has been linked to higher risks of ovarian cancer. The risk is one, a woman can take for a variety of reasons; one of them being to help have children. However, women are being asked to incur this risk to "donate" their eggs solely for money. Women who sell their eggs to firms like Advanced Cell Technology will likely disproportionately be of women who are already somewhat disenfranchised, or of lower income. In fact, it is now known that Advanced Cell Technology paid \$4,000 to each woman who "donated" her eggs.

I would say that is probably more than a donation if you pay \$4,000 for the egg. I suggest if this doesn't qualify as exploitation of the disenfranchised for profiteering motives, I am not sure what does.

This is not just a pro-life or pro-choice debate. It is not that at all.

In fact, pro-choice feminist Judy Norsigian and biologist Stuart Newman recently commented in a Boston Globe column,

Because embryo cloning will compromise women's health, turn their eggs and wombs into commodities, compromise their reproductive autonomy and, with virtual certainty, lead to the production of "experimental" human beings, we are convinced that the line must be drawn here.

That is strong language. Experimental human beings, eggs and wombs turned into commodities, and compromising women's health.

Perhaps that is why this debate is not a debate, as someone suggested, on the issue of abortion. And perhaps that is why we have an interesting coalition forming of groups that are strongly opposed to abortion, groups that strongly support abortion, environmentalists, and others. The reason for the broad range of interest is that there is truly something about this issue which should concern all of us.

I would like to read a few of the articles appearing in recent months for the benefit of some of my colleagues. The first article is by Sophia Kolehmainen of the Council for Responsible Genetics, a pro-choice group chaired by Claire Nader. Claire is the sister of Ralph Nader, the Presidential candidate. She was actively involved in the Presidential campaign. This is what their group had to say about human cloning. This is the article they put forward. It is entitled "Human Cloning: Brave New Mistake."

It would be a mistake to develop and use cloning as a technique to replicate human beings. It is questionable whether and what benefits would be gained from the successful creation of a cloned human being, and whether they would justify the radical impact cloning would have on our society. Cloning is not just another reproductive technology that should be made available to those who choose to use it, but is an unnecessary and dangerous departure from evolutionary processes and social practices that have developed over millions of years. As with many other developments in biotechnology, some scientists and commentators are asking us to accept cloning of humans just because it is technically possible,

but there are few good reasons to develop the technology, and many reasons not to develop it.

1. SAFETY CONCERN

The most frequently stated argument against cloning is based on safety concerns. At this point in the process of experimenting with cloning, such concerns are important. The production of Dolly required at least 276 failed attempts. No one knows why most of these attempts failed and only one succeeded. From a technical viewpoint, cloning presents different obstacles in every species, since embryo implantation, development, and gestation differ among different species. Human cloning therefore could not become a reality without extensive human experimentation. Though 276 "failed" lambs may be acceptable losses, the ethical implications of any failed or only partially successful human experiments are unacceptable.

Some of their article I don't necessarily agree with, but I am reading through their arguments.

2. COMMODIFICATION

Cloning would encourage the commodification of humans. Though industrialized societies commodify human labor and human lives, the biological commodification involved in human cloning would be of a vastly different order. Cloning would turn procreation into a manufacturing process, where human characteristics become added options and children become objects of deliberate design. Such a process of commodification needs to be actively opposed. It produces no benefits and undermines the very basis of our established notions of human individuality and dignity.

3. DIVERSITY

Cloning would also disrespect human diversity in ethnicity and ability. Though it is, in fact, not possible to produce exact copies of animals or people, inherent in cloning is the desire to do so. The process of cloning would necessarily contribute to genetic uniformity by decreasing genetic variety. A society that supported cloning as an acceptable procreative technique would imply that human diversity is not important. Especially in a multicultural nation like the United States, where diversity and difference are at the root of our cultural existence, any procedure that would reduce our acceptance of differences would be dangerous. It is clear from the tensions that exist in our society that we should encourage processes that increase our appreciation for diversity among individuals, not working to remove differences.

Dr. Brent Blackwelder, president of Friends of the Earth, put forward a strong statement in opposition to human cloning. This is a pro-choice group which put forward a strong statement in opposition to cloning for many of the same reasons that I have put forward.

There are other groups that are putting forward clear and convincing reasons why we should not do cloning. For those reasons and many others, I ask this body to take up the bill numbered 2505 on Monday, and vote for cloture on the moratorium prohibiting human cloning for 6 months. There is ample reason for us to have a moratorium for 6 months.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia, Mr. CLELAND, is recognized.

THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT REFORM BILL, ENERGY LEGISLATION, AND ANWR

Mr. CLELAND. Mr. President, I rise today to address three issues on which we will be voting in the Senate on Monday: The railroad retirement reform bill, the comprehensive energy legislation, and the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge legislation.

First of all, I would like to express my support for the railroad retirement reform bill. As thousands of Georgians who have contacted my office in support of this legislation will state, action by the Senate on this legislation is long overdue. I was pleased to support the cloture vote that occurred yesterday to move to this legislation.

The House of Representatives passed this legislation more than once by overwhelming, bipartisan majorities, and the Senate version has 74 cosponsors, including my sponsorship. I think this bill should receive the same opportunity for a vote. Not only would current and former employees benefit from this legislation but also the widows and widowers of former employees.

This legislation is the result of a long effort by both industry and labor to reform the railroad retirement system. Not often does Congress have the opportunity to vote on a cooperative effort supported by virtually everybody affected in the industry. We have that opportunity now. We should take advantage of it. We would be remiss to ignore it and not support it.

We have heard from the small numbers of Senators who threaten this bill's ability to make it to the President's desk. These same colleagues joined me in support of a tax break package earlier this year which cost more than \$1 trillion. At that time, we supported the tax legislation because of the potential economic stimulus it could provide. I say reforming the railroad retirement system will also provide such stimulus by freeing up funds that could be reinvested in the economy by the over 1 million active and retired rail workers and their families and the rail companies.

This country exploded as the railroads moved west. It was the physical incarnation of manifest destiny. Since the time these initial courageous workers linked this country, hundreds of thousands of workers have followed in their footsteps to maintain and expand their work. These workers and their families would benefit from this legislation.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this legislation and provide long overdue reform to the railroad retirement system.

However, this railroad retirement bill is not the appropriate vehicle to address comprehensive energy legislation. It is essential that we pass a comprehensive energy bill that, No. 1, provides consumers with affordable and reliable energy; No. 2, increases domestic energy supplies in a responsible manner; No. 3, invests in energy efficiency

and renewable energy sources; and, No. 4, protects the environment and public health.

The inclusion of renewable energy sources is vital because I believe energy sources, such as wind, geothermal, solar, hydropower, and biomass, along with energy-efficient technologies, will help offset fuel imports, create numerous employment opportunities, and actually enhance export markets.

Finally, I would like to address my particular concerns about opening up the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to oil drilling.

Earlier this year, my colleagues who supported ANWR drilling argued that U.S. gas prices were out of control and therefore ANWR needed to be drilled immediately. Since then, gas prices have fallen dramatically, despite the war in Afghanistan. In fact, over the Thanksgiving holiday, I returned to Georgia and I routinely saw gas prices in Georgia substantially below \$1 a gallon. As a matter of fact, I did see some prices at 76 cents a gallon. Those prices have not been seen at the pumps in more than a year.

Since September 11, the price per barrel of oil has dropped \$12 to the current price of \$18 per barrel. ANWR does not need to be drilled but rather protected so generations from now can see its beauty as we see it today.

I will support efforts to protect ANWR from drilling, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut, Mr. LIEBERMAN, is recognized.

DRILLING IN ANWR

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I come to this Chamber—and I am pleased to do so after the excellent statement by my friend and colleague from Georgia—to speak about the addition of the House energy bill to the railroad retirement bill before us. This amendment is the wrong amendment offered at the wrong time.

The House energy bill, with all due respect, is, in my opinion, an unwise proposal that was written really for a different time, as Senator CLELAND's remarks not only suggest but illustrate quite specifically. The bill proposes to open the Arctic Refuge for drilling, which is bad environmental policy and bad energy policy.

We will soon have the opportunity to give our Nation's long-term energy strategy the thoughtful consideration that it deserves and that the American people deserve. I look forward to the introduction by the majority leader, soon, of his balanced, comprehensive energy bill, and I look forward to debating it when we return after the first of the year.

We should not be attempting to pass such significant legislation dealing with so fundamental and complicated a problem as America's energy needs and systems in such a summary fashion as

an amendment to a bill of this kind. We should, and I am confident will, give it the thorough, thoughtful, balanced debate after the first of the year.

We owe it to the American people to determine whether the measure before us is a responsible and responsive solution to our energy needs or simply a distraction. To determine that, we do not need to hold up pictures of baby caribou or mother polar bears, although I find those pictures not only attractive but moving. We only need to ask a very businesslike question: What do we gain and what do we lose from drilling for oil in ANWR?

I think, when we work that question back dispassionately to an answer, we see the error of the proposal to drill in the Arctic Refuge that is before the Senate today and will be voted on on Monday, procedurally at least.

I can tell you what we gain in probably less than a minute. It would take days to catalog what we lose. I am prepared, if necessary, if the occasion arises, to take days to talk about and catalog what we will lose as a nation if we drill in the Arctic Refuge.

So let me start with what I believe, in fairness, we would gain.

Even if oil companies started drilling tomorrow in the refuge—which, of course, is never going to happen that quickly—even if we mistakenly adopted this legislation, it would take at least 10 years for any crude to be delivered to refineries. The U.S. Geological Survey estimates there is, at best, a 6-month supply of economically recoverable oil—a yield that would be spread over 50 years.

What are the costs?

The visible damage, of course, would be substantial: An environmental treasure permanently lost, hundreds of species threatened, international agreements jeopardized, oil spills further endangering the Alaskan landscape, and an increase in air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions, among other costs.

The unseen damage of drilling would be just as real: A nation lulled into believing it has taken a step toward energy independence—arguably, by its supporters, a large step—when, in fact, it has done no such thing; a nation believing it is extracting oil in an environmentally sensitive way, when, in fact, no methods have been discovered that can avoid damage to this beautiful, untouched wilderness area of America; all in all, the American people misled on a host of critical issues. Finally, this plan would threaten something even more precious than what I have mentioned; that is, some of our most treasured American values, including the fundamental American value of conserving, conservation, conserving what the Good Lord has given us in natural treasures in the 50 American States.

The first claim that my colleagues make is that drilling in the Arctic is a necessary part of a balanced, long-term energy strategy. But, respectfully, call-

ing this part of a strategic energy plan is as if to call crude oil a beverage; it is literally and figuratively hard to swallow. This ill-considered plan will do nothing to wean us from our dependence on foreign oil.

Drilling in the Alaskan national wildlife refuge is, in fact, a pipeline dream, a decision that will produce just a slight uptick in our oil production 10 years down the road and at considerable cost to our environment, our values, and our policies. It will create far fewer jobs than dozens of smarter alternatives which depend on American technology and American innovation and American industry.

The much quoted study indicating that Arctic drilling would result in 750,000 jobs has since been widely discredited. Even its authors have acknowledged that its methodology was flawed. Now the agreed-upon job creation figure is much closer to 43,000, and all of those jobs are short term, as opposed to the permanent jobs that would be created through the development of other alternative, innovative forms of energy, including conservation.

This plan also does not move us one step closer to the very valuable, critical goal of energy independence. First, it will take at least a decade to bring to market any oil that might be discovered in the refuge, making it useless in the context of the current international crisis. Incidentally, there is a conservative estimate from the Department of the Interior during the administration of former President Bush that has since been reiterated by many people, including oil industry executives, and that is the 10-year lead-in time.

Secondly, we should realize that Alaskan crude oil is not shipped east of the Rocky Mountains, meaning that none of this oil is refined into home heating oil that is used in the entire Northeast and other parts of Middle America. Further, oil supplies are not needed for the production of electricity. Nationwide, only 2 percent of electricity is generated by oil.

Finally, let's realize that increasing our dependence on oil as a source of energy is no way to wean ourselves off foreign oil in the long run. The statistics repeated frequently make it clear that we cannot drill our way into energy independence. The United States uses about 25 percent of the world's oil but possesses only 2 percent of its reserves. So the way to energy independence is clearly through conservation, through using less than 25 percent of the world's oil and for the development of new technologies that will provide genuine energy independence.

The most important step, of course, we can take is reducing oil use in the transportation sector, which is responsible for over two-thirds of the oil consumed in the United States, and it is climbing. We can do that with technological methods that are in reach. Many of them are in our grasp already in our vehicles.