

which would be better than what we have. With 54 different Senators listed as cosponsors, that says to me a majority of this Senate wants to do something and do it now. All of the budget proposals floating around out there include money for a prescription drug benefit.

Both parties made this promise to our elderly in the 2000 election. So why are we waiting? How much longer must we wait? How long are we going to continue to play this nonproductive, partisan, never ending ping-pong game of retribution and payback that takes up so much valuable time and, frankly, makes us all look silly and petty? How long will we keep using the antiquated rules that slow down everything to a crippled snail's pace, that on a regular basis thwarts the clear will of the majority of this body and instead substitutes the tyranny of a minority? We should stop this dilatory dillydallying and put up a sign around here that says "No Loitering."

We should cut down on some of this Presidential candidate posturing. I know you cannot do away with all of it, of course. But you want to be a contender? Quit preaching and preening and produce. You want the well off to show you the money? Show the not so well off a prescription drug benefit.

To do that, you will have to say no to some of those high-priced political strategists, those consultants who couldn't get elected dogcatcher themselves, whose advice is always the same: Have an issue, not a result. Never compromise, never accept a half of loaf of anything.

Remember FDR once said:

Try something. If it doesn't work, try something else. But for God's sake, try something.

That is what I am trying to say. I want Hoyle and all those millions like him in the land of plenty who have played by the rules and worked hard all of their lives to have some peace and hope in the twilight days of their last years.

If this so-called center of democracy keeps piddling and procrastinating and postponing this issue, I hope the American people will rise up as did those fans at that football game in Cleveland and run both teams off the field.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. WYDEN. For the purpose of a unanimous consent request, I ask to be recognized after the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WYDEN. I appreciate the graciousness of the Senator from Tennessee, and I ask unanimous consent that at this time morning business be extended for 10 minutes so at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Tennessee I can speak as if in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Tennessee.

HUMAN CLONING

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, in the coming weeks the Senate will consider legislation to prohibit human cloning. In advance of that important debate, which will center upon this intersection of values, of ethics as it crosses with science, many have begun studying in a very careful way this complex issue.

A number of colleagues have come forward and asked me, personally, about this issue, in part because of my medical background, but also in large part because they know I am a strong advocate for and a strong supporter of stem cell research, as long as that stem cell research is conducted within a framework of a comprehensive, ethical, and moral oversight system.

The question I hear most is the following: Can one truly be an advocate for stem cell research and, at the same time, oppose human cloning experimentation? After an in-depth study of this issue from a policy standpoint, from the standpoint of being a Senator and looking at that legislation as a science, from a medical standpoint, I believe the answer to this question is yes.

Until now, the overall human cloning debate has been presented almost as an absolute choice between, on the one hand, medical science and the hope for cures and, on the other, ethical restraint.

This is an oversimplification that does not do justice to the clinical, scientific, philosophical, moral, ethical, and spiritual complexities underlying this discussion. I am glad to see that a number of my colleagues and people around the country have not locked into this false choice, but rather have stayed back to examine these in our deliberations.

After carefully considering all of the evidence brought forward in hearings and on the floor in support of human embryo research cloning experimentation, after considering the medical progress being made and that will be made through stem cell research, and after considering the overwhelming ethical concerns about human embryo cloning experimentation, I conclude that a comprehensive ban on all human cloning is the right policy at this time. I intend to support legislation consistent with this policy, and I will encourage my colleagues to do likewise.

As we move forward, one must understand the fundamental fact that I hope plays out over the next several days and weeks in the discussion. It is important; that is, embryonic stem cell research and human embryo cloning research are not the same thing. Human embryo research cloning—called therapeutic or research embryo cloning—is an experimental technique often confused with but distinct from stem cell

research. The promise of stem cell research, for Parkinson's disease, Alzheimer's disease, diabetes, spinal cord injuries, autoimmune disorders, cardiovascular disease—the promise of stem cell research and the science can and will progress with a ban on human cloning embryo experimentation.

Most serious observers—I don't want to say all—agree that human reproductive cloning should be banned, must be banned. Indeed the legislation that will come to this floor will ban reproductive cloning. It is dangerous and it is unethical.

The question this body will be debating is whether or not this ban on human reproductive cloning should extend to all human embryo cloning. The issue is not cloning of DNA, that is going to continue no matter what; not cloning of molecules, that is going to continue; not cloning of cells other than cells that become or are an embryo, that is going to continue. That is not yet fully understood and, in truth, we have not debated the legislation on this floor. But that will become apparent.

The House of Representatives has already overwhelmingly passed strong bipartisan legislation comprehensively banning human embryo research cloning experimentation and reproductive cloning. Now is the time for the Senate to do so.

Those who favor human research cloning experiments often point to its potential to develop tissues that will not be rejected. In fact, on the next chart—which I will not deal with today, but will come back to—are the arguments, the overall claims that human research cloning, or human cloning research is necessary to prevent immune rejection and is necessary for other reasons.

As a heart transplant surgeon, one who spent many years of my life transplanting hearts, this immune phenomenon is something I will come back to the floor and talk about because it is very important for us to address. Advocates for human embryo research cloning and so-called therapeutic embryonic cloning experiments say it will increase the number of embryonic stem cells. We will talk about that. They say it will further basic biological knowledge. Again, we will come back and talk about that as the debate proceeds.

There are facts that will need to be presented. But moving away from the scientific standpoint, if you look at the overall ethical and moral concern, it is this: Regardless of our religious background, most of us—maybe I should say many, but I believe most of us—are extremely uncomfortable today with the idea of creating cloned human embryos, doing an experiment on them, and destroying the human embryo. That is the state of the science. That is the state of the art.

If one supports human research or therapeutic cloning, given where we are today—our understanding of science—you are in support of purposefully creating an embryo, of removing

the cells, and thereby destroying that embryo.

The other concerns which people will talk about—although I think this is the concern that most people will start with—will be concerns about women's health. Human cloning clearly will create a market for women's eggs. That is going to create powerful incentives for women to undergo an intense regimen of superovulation drugs and surgery, with potentially devastating side effects.

As a physician and a policymaker who struggles, especially since I have come to Washington, with this inherent tension between scientific progress and ethical concerns, I think there are two fundamental questions that this body needs to answer, and the American people need to answer: No. 1, does the scientific potential of human embryo cloning experimentation justify this purposeful creation of human embryos which must, by definition, be destroyed in the experiments? The second question is: Does the promise of human embryonic stem cell research—and, again, this is separate from cloning—in any way depend on the experimental research cloning, the human cloning research technique or tool? To both of those questions I answer no.

At this point in the evolution of this new science, I believe there is no justification for the purposeful creation and destruction of human embryos in order to experiment with them, especially when the promise and success of stem cell research does not—does not—depend on the experimental research cloning technique. As my colleagues know, I am a strong supporter of stem cell—including embryonic stem cells—research, as long as that stem cell research is conducted within an ethical and moral framework.

Last August, President Bush outlined a scientific and ethically balanced policy that allows Federal funding, through the National Institutes of Health, for embryonic stem cell research, using nearly 80 stem cell lines. This has, indeed, opened the door to a significant expansion of embryonic stem cell research within this ethical and moral framework.

A lot of people do not realize today that there are no restrictions—whether there should be or should not be is not the subject of the legislation that will come to the floor—but it is important to realize there are no restrictions on private research using embryonic stem cells from embryos left over after in vitro fertilization procedures. Thus, when you come to that argument of just having a technique which produces more embryos, I would argue that there is simply no compelling need for any other source of embryonic stem cells today.

The state of the science and the state of the research we will be addressing again on the floor as we go forward. But given the serious ethical concerns on human embryonic cloning research, given the fact that there is a lack of

significant research in animal models—and again most people do not realize that we are talking about human cloning experimentation creating human embryos. This research has not even been conducted in animal models at this juncture. Thus, I find no compelling justification for allowing human cloning, reproductive or research, today.

It is important also—and I will very quickly go through this—to be clear that we are talking about a ban on reproductive cloning along with a ban on what is called research or therapeutic cloning, but it is all human embryo cloning. But the bill allows other types of cloning research to continue—many people do not realize that—whether it is cloning to produce animals, cloning to produce plants, cloning any cell other than a human embryo, cloning of DNA and RNA, proteins or any other molecule. In fact, I will not go through the entire list now.

The point is, the cloning science continues. The ban is on the cloning of the human embryo: the purposeful creation of an embryo for human reproduction or for experimentation and its ultimate destruction, which is what we are banning today.

I would indeed argue that any potential benefit of cloning should be carried out—should be demonstrated in animal models before going to the human model.

I wanted to make the statement today based on my assessment of where we are. There will be plenty of time to debate this later. With that I will close.

I want to say, once again, I will support legislation to ban all forms of human embryo cloning, reproductive, research and therapeutic, when the issue comes before the Senate. I, indeed, will urge my colleagues to do likewise.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

FOREST MANAGEMENT

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, 6 years ago last month I gave my first speech in the Senate Chamber. It dealt with an especially important forestry issue. I continue to have significant interests in these matters as chairman of the Subcommittee on Forests and Public Land Management.

In particular, as chairman of this key subcommittee, I am committed to ending the tradition of suspicion and disagreement that has characterized so much of forest management over the decades. I am pleased to be able to announce this morning a development that takes a significant step in that direction.

In March of 1996, what brought me to this floor was my opposition to the so-called salvage rider, an approach that allowed timber sales to jeopardize the health of the forests in my home State of Oregon and elsewhere. I believed

then, as I do now, that salvage sales that eliminate public input, prohibit legal appeal, and limit environmental analysis, are anathema to responsible and effective forest management. Now, 6 years later, I rise in this Senate to announce the cancellation of a particularly important salvage rider timber sale and to emphasize that, in my view, salvage riders are no way to do business in the natural resources field.

I am pleased to be able to announce this morning the cancellation of the Eagle Creek timber sale in my home State of Oregon. From its inception, I believed the Eagle Creek salvage sale was not subject to adequate review and that the planned logging would result in excessive environmental damage. For more than 3 years, I have worked to prevent that damage. In July of 2000, I called on the Department of Agriculture to convene an independent review team to analyze the threat. The team found that, indeed, the sale did pose a greater risk than anticipated to the well-being of the Eagle Creek forest.

Today, I offer my thanks to Agriculture Secretary, Ann Veneman, who followed through on her commitment to review the team's findings, for choosing to implement them, and for effectively stopping the timber sale that would have done significant environmental damage.

The Eagle Creek sale is an example of a sale that should never have moved forward in the first place. At the core, section 318 salvage sales are inherently flawed because they take the American people, the public that we represent, out of the process of managing public land. As I thank the Secretary of Agriculture for stopping this flawed sale this morning, I call on the administration to oppose further salvage riders. Those who would follow the failed Eagle Creek effort are no more likely to respect the health of the Nation's forests or the wishes and needs of the Nation's forest communities and stakeholders.

When the Government pursues natural resources issues with no opportunity for public comment, discussion, or appeal, the only result is distrust and dissention. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Forests and Public Lands Management, on my watch I am going to do everything to work with my colleagues on a bipartisan basis to avoid that kind of approach.

I am especially pleased the county payments laws that I authored with our colleague from Idaho, Senator LARRY CRAIG, are an example of how the logjam over forest policy can be broken. That is an approach that provides for the ecological health of forests and also helps to ensure the economic survival for scores of rural communities. Our county payments legislation helps widen the way for a real discussion of forest management policy and an open discussion that must continue.

I come to the floor this morning to reaffirm my commitment to new and