

(such as the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), the National Liberation Army (ELN), and the United Self-Defense Forces of Colombia (AUC)); and

(2) to take actions to protect human health and welfare in emergency circumstances, including undertaking rescue operations.

(b) **APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN LAWS AND LIMITATIONS.**—The use of funds pursuant to the authority in subsection (a) shall be subject to the following:

(1) Sections 556, 567, and 568 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2002 (Public Law 107-115; 115 Stat. 2160, 2165, and 2166).

(2) Section 8077 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2004 (Public Law 108-87; 117 Stat. 1090).

(3) The numerical limitations on the number of United States military personnel and United States individual civilian contractors in section 3204(b)(1) of the Emergency Supplemental Act, 2000 (division B of Public Law 106-246; 114 Stat. 575), as amended by the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2002 (115 Stat. 2131).

(c) **LIMITATION ON PARTICIPATION OF UNITED STATES PERSONNEL.**—No United States Armed Forces personnel or United States civilian contractor employed by the United States Armed Forces will participate in any combat operation in connection with assistance made available under this section, except for the purpose of acting in self defense or during the course of search and rescue operations for United States citizens.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to, that the amendments that are at the desk be agreed to, that the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table en bloc, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The amendments (Nos. 4059 and 4060) were agreed to, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 4059

(Purpose: To strike section 306, relating to a repeal of the limitation on the length of service as a member of the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate)

On page 16, strike lines 1 through 16.

AMENDMENT NO. 4060

On page 9, line 16, add at the end the following: "Such funds shall remain available until September 30, 2005."

On page 16, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

SEC. 307. INTELLIGENCE ASSESSMENT ON SANCTUARIES FOR TERRORISTS.

(a) **ASSESSMENT REQUIRED.**—Not later than the date specified in subsection (b), the Director of Central Intelligence shall submit to Congress an intelligence assessment that identifies and describes each country or region that is a sanctuary for terrorists or terrorist organizations. The assessment shall be based on current all-source intelligence.

(b) **SUBMITTAL DATE.**—The date of the submittal of the intelligence assessment required by subsection (a) shall be the earlier of—

(1) the date that is six months after the date of the enactment of this Act; or

(2) June 1, 2005.

SEC. 308. ADDITIONAL EXTENSION OF DEADLINE FOR FINAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE REVIEW OF THE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS OF THE UNITED STATES INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.

Section 1007(a) of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107-306; 50 U.S.C. 401 note) is amended by striking "September 1, 2004" and inserting "September 1, 2005".

SEC. 309. FOUR-YEAR EXTENSION OF PUBLIC INTEREST DECLASSIFICATION BOARD.

Section 710(b) of the Public Interest Declassification Act of 2000 (title VII of Public Law 106-567; 114 Stat. 2856; 50 U.S.C. 435 note) is amended by striking "4 years" and inserting "8 years".

On page 19, strike lines 7 through 15 and insert the following:

"(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director may establish and administer a nonofficial cover employee retirement system for designated employees (and the spouse, former spouses, and survivors of such designated employees). A des—

On page 21, strike line 18 and all that follows through page 22, line 1, and insert the following:

"(iii) in the case of a designated employee who participated in an employee investment retirement system established under paragraph (1) and is converted to coverage under subchapter III of chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code, the Director may transmit any or all amounts of that designated employee in that employee investment retirement system (or similar

On page 22, strike line 24 and all that follows through page 23, line 5, and insert the following:

"(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director may establish and administer a nonofficial cover employee health insurance program for designated employees (and the family of such designated employees). A designated employee

On page 25, strike lines 6 through 12 and insert the following:

"(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director may establish and administer a nonofficial cover employee life insurance program for designated employees (and the family of such designated employees). A designated employee may not

On page 27, line 8, strike "(B)(iii)" and insert "(B)(iv)".

On page 30, strike lines 10 through 16.

The bill (S. 2386), as amended, was read the third time and passed, as follows:

(The bill will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.)

AMENDING SECTION OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. SESSIONS. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 4306, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4306) to amend Section 274A of the Immigration and Nationality Act to improve the process for verifying an individual's eligibility for employment.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be

laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (H.R. 4306) was read the third time and passed.

AMENDING AND AUTHORIZING JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER ACT AND JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR PERFORMING ARTS

Mr. SESSIONS. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to consideration of H.R. 5294, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 5294) to amend the John F. Kennedy Center Act to authorize appropriations for the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (H.R. 5294) was read the third time and passed.

IMPROVING ACCESS TO PHYSICIANS IN MEDICALLY UNDERSERVED AREAS

Mr. SESSIONS. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 775, S. 2302.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2302) to improve access to physicians in medically underserved areas.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: [Strike the part in black brackets and insert in lieu thereof the part printed in italic.]

S. 2302

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. WAIVER OF FOREIGN COUNTRY RESIDENCE REQUIREMENT WITH RESPECT TO INTERNATIONAL MEDICAL GRADUATES.

[(a) **EXTENSION OF DEADLINE.**—Section 220(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Technical Corrections Act of 1994 (8 U.S.C. 1182 note) (as amended by section 11018 of Public Law 107-273) is amended by striking "2004." and inserting "2009."]

[(b) **DESIGNATION OF HEALTH PROFESSIONAL SHORTAGE AREAS BY STATE AGENCIES.**—Section 214(l)(1)(D) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184(l)(1)(D)) is amended—

[(1) by striking "professionals," and inserting "professionals or in other shortage locations specified by a State department of public health (or its equivalent),"; and

[(2) by striking "in a geographic area designated by the Secretary," and inserting "in such a geographic area or other shortage location."]

[(c) EXEMPTION FROM H-1B NUMERICAL LIMITATIONS.—Section 214(l)(2)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184(l)(2)(A)) is amended by adding at the end the following: "The numerical limitations contained in subsection (g)(1)(A) shall not apply to any alien whose status is changed under the preceding sentence, if the alien obtained a waiver of the 2-year foreign residence requirement upon a request by an interested State agency.".]

SECTION 1. MODIFICATION OF VISA REQUIREMENTS WITH RESPECT TO INTERNATIONAL MEDICAL GRADUATES.

(a) EXTENSION OF DEADLINE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 220(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Technical Corrections Act of 1994 (8 U.S.C. 1182 note) (as amended by section 11018 of Public Law 107-273) is amended by striking "2004." and inserting "2006.".

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect as if enacted on May 31, 2004.

(b) EXEMPTION FROM H-1B NUMERICAL LIMITATIONS.—Section 214(l)(2)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184(l)(2)(A)) is amended by adding at the end the following: "The numerical limitations contained in subsection (g)(1)(A) shall not apply to any alien whose status is changed under the preceding sentence, if the alien obtained a waiver of the 2-year foreign residence requirement upon a request by an interested Federal agency or an interested State agency.".

(c) LIMITATION ON MEDICAL PRACTICE AREAS.—Section 214(l)(1)(D) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184(l)(1)(D)) is amended by striking "agrees to practice medicine" and inserting "agrees to practice primary care or specialty medicine".

(d) EXEMPTIONS.—Section 214(l)(1)(D) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184(l)(1)(D)) is further amended—

(1) by striking "except that," and all that follows and inserting "except that—"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(i) in the case of a request by the Department of Veterans Affairs, the alien shall not be required to practice medicine in a geographic area designated by the Secretary;

"(ii) in the case of a request by an interested State agency, the head of such State agency determines that the alien is to practice medicine under such agreement in a facility that serves patients who reside in one or more geographic areas so designated by the Secretary of Health and Human Services (without regard to whether such facility is located within such a designated geographic area), and the grant of such waiver would not cause the number of the waivers granted on behalf of aliens for such State for a fiscal year (within the limitation in subparagraph (B)) in accordance with the conditions of this clause to exceed 5; and

"(iii) in the case of a request by an interested Federal agency or by an interested State agency for a waiver for an alien who agrees to practice specialty medicine in a facility located in a geographic area so designated by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the request shall demonstrate, based on criteria established by such agency, that there is a shortage of health care professionals able to provide services in the appropriate medical specialty to the patients who will be served by the alien.".

Mr. SESSIONS. I ask unanimous consent that the committee substitute amendment be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read a third time and

passed, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill (S. 2302), as amended, was read the third time and passed.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I believe that is all I have. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. Madam President, I was struck by the fact that when my colleague from Alabama presented his chart on economic growth, it stopped at the end of last year and did not carry forward into this year. Of course, had it carried forward into this year, it would have shown a declining trend in economic growth and that is a matter, obviously, of very deep concern. In fact, there was a story last week, a Reuters news story last week, that said:

Top U.S. executives are pessimistic about next year's U.S. economy. About 70 percent of the chief executives surveyed by the Business Council projected flat to 2 percent U.S. economic growth. More bearish than forecasts by major economists, the Business Council survey, often seen as a gauge of corporate sentiment, was released ahead of a meeting of the group's members, about 125 CEOs from companies . . .

Then they cite a number of the large companies in the country, saying generally CEOs are a bit more pessimistic, referring to the difference of opinion between executives and economists.

The U.S. economy actually grew at a 3.3 percent annual rate in the second quarter of this year. Now these chief executives are projecting a flat to 2-percent growth. My colleagues on the other side, if you bring these uncomfortable facts to their attention, they say, well, you are talking doom and gloom. But how are we going to realistically deal with our problems if we do not face what our problems are?

I want to address one question, because the previous presentation talked as though the only relevant factor is economic growth. It never addressed job growth. It only addressed job growth in the sense of saying if you had economic growth, you would have job growth. If you didn't have economic growth, you would have job loss. But the problem is more complicated than that, the problem we are confronting right now. I want to point out a couple of factors in that regard.

This chart shows how unemployment has moved in previous postwar recoveries, and how it is moving in this one. What it shows: Of course, you obviously get a downward trend in employment as you go into a recession. Then you try to come out of a recession. Of course, recessions are measured by economic growth figures. In the average of postwar recoveries, this is what has happened with respect to employment.

We have had this kind of growth. So we have had a good, rising trend in employment.

In this recession, this is what has happened to employment. There is a huge gap here in terms of the recovery with respect to jobs. That is why we are so concerned about jobs. That is why we continuously stress that point.

This figure was underscored earlier in the conversation we had about the number of long-term unemployed, which has jumped so substantially. One question becomes, Why are we not getting the jobs? I think one answer to that is to be found in these two charts. What we see in recent years is a sharp increase in productivity. In other words, that is what a worker can produce for each hour of work. But we do not see an increase in worker wages. Productivity is growing much faster than worker wages. The workers who are producing more for each hour worked are, in effect, not sharing in the benefits and their wages are running virtually constant.

One might ask, What happened in other recessions? What usually happens is that worker wages, as you come out of the recession, rise commensurate with their share of the economy, which is about two-thirds. But here is what is happening this time. The worker wages are not rising, but the corporate profits are rising 65 percent. So most of the benefit from the economic growth in this partial recovery is not going to the workers, but it is going to corporate profits. This is in marked contrast with previous recoveries. I want to underscore that point. This is a very different pattern than we have seen in the past. Of course, part of the reason for that is the policies of this administration.

Then the counterargument is made on the other side: If you give the corporation these profits, they will invest them and therefore strengthen the economy, build the economy and create jobs. But here is what has happened in this Bush administration. These are the growth rates of plant and equipment investment by U.S. corporations. As you can see, it actually is down, negative during this Bush administration, compared with previous administrations in which it was a positive figure. So what is happening is the benefits are being skewed away from the workers, but those receiving the benefits are not investing them in the economy in order to build businesses and create jobs. That, of course, explains in part, in my view, why there is such a tremendous lag in this recovery in terms of producing jobs. There is no way you can get around the fact.

I listened earlier. No one actually challenged any of the figures or facts about the employment situation. There is no way you can get around the fact that this is the first administration in 75 years not to have a net gain of jobs in the course of the administration. They are still down 825,000 jobs from where they were when they came into

office. They are down 1.6 million jobs in the private sector and they are down 2.7 million manufacturing jobs.

My colleague from Alabama says we have produced this year a gain of 93,000 jobs. He says that is a good thing. It is a good thing in the sense that we want to be positive in producing manufacturing jobs. It is not such a good thing if you put it in the context of the fact that we have lost 2.7 million jobs since January of 2001. If you put the figure in context, I am relieved that we gained a few manufacturing jobs this year. That is certainly better than losing them. But if you are looking at the record of this administration, the fact is in the course of this administration they have lost 2.7 million manufacturing jobs.

You can come to the floor and say we gained 93,000 manufacturing jobs this year, and that is a good thing. As far as that statement goes, it is a good thing. But it is in the context of the fact that we lost 2.7 million jobs over this time period, over the entire time period. That also relates, of course, to the points that are being made now about the gain in jobs that has taken place—well, the month that is usually used by my colleagues on the other side is, I think, August of 2003. I am pleased and relieved that we have gained some jobs. But the fact remains these job gains have tailed off in recent months.

The other side would have a story to tell if they had sustained job gains. They might have gotten out of the hole and actually produced more jobs, a net gain of jobs in the course of their administration. The Treasury Secretary was projecting it would create a huge number of jobs. It has not happened.

As this chart indicates, we are on a descending line month to month in terms of job creation going back to the beginning of this year. That is the concern about jobs.

It is fine and good to come to the floor and show economic growth charts, although one would have hoped that the chart would have carried out into this year and not stopped at the end of last year.

Second, one has to take into account what people are now saying about what to expect on economic growth, and particularly the story from last week about the Business Council meeting. The leading U.S. corporation chief executives met in Irving, TX, where the top U.S. chief executives said they are pessimistic about next year's economy. About 70 percent of the chief executives surveyed by the Business Council projected flat to 2 percent U.S. economic growth.

That is why we are concerned. That is why the public is concerned. That is why working people are concerned. They feel it.

You may come to the floor and say everything is a rosy scenario. But if you are long-term unemployed, you know it is not a rosy scenario. Long-term unemployed now as a share of the unemployed is at the highest figure it has been—over 20 percent now for 24 straight months.

Trying to portray a rosy scenario is not going to take care of the problem of the long-term unemployed. We tried to do something about that in the Senate. We tried to extend the unemployment benefits, but that was beaten back, regrettably. People who exhaust their benefits and aren't able to find a job find themselves in dire circumstances in terms of meeting the needs of their families.

I think we have a serious job unemployment situation. I think we need to face it. I don't think it helps to simply try to brush it away, paper it over. These trend lines, regrettably, are not working in the right direction.

Now, with this forecast from these top U.S. executives of the Business Council, we can see that we face an even greater challenge as we move towards 2005.

I simply close with the observation that this administration has not produced a net gain of jobs in the course of its tenure. You have to go all the way back to Herbert Hoover to find an administration, whether Democrat or Republican, through that period that failed to produce a net gain of jobs in the course of that administration. That, of course, is one of the very key reasons this election that comes before us on November 2 is so important for the future of our country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Maryland. I know he is very skilled in his knowledge of these issues. I don't know how the President can be blamed for this or that, or how any President can be.

I will just say this: When President Bush took office this economy was in trouble. In the first quarter he inherited there was negative growth; the second quarter was negative growth; the third quarter was 9/11. In the third quarter of former President Clinton's last year in office there was substantial negative growth, and one-half of the value of the NASDAQ stock exchange had been lost by the time President Bush took office. I will just say that he inherited a problem. And in the last 12 to 15 months, 1.9 million jobs have been created in this country. We had growth as high as 8 percent late last year for the third quarter, which is the highest growth in 20 years.

Yes. We have challenges. Five and four-tenths percent unemployment is too high for me. It is a lot better than Europe. It is a lot better than most countries in the world. But it is not good enough.

But I note this: The 5.4 percent unemployment rate that we have today, which we are working to improve, is better than the average unemployment rate of the 1970s, 1980s, or 1990s.

I hope we will continue to work on it here together in Congress, the President and everyone, to see what we can do to continue to help grow the econ-

omy. Certainly, if we don't have a growing economy we will not create jobs.

Mr. SARBANES. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SESSIONS. Yes.

Mr. SARBANES. Was the Senator disappointed by the jobs figures for the month of September of 96,000?

Mr. SESSIONS. I have not been disappointed for the last 6 months of job figures. There have been some tremendous numbers. What was the highest month we had this year? There were 300,000 or 400,000 jobs created in 1 month, and there was 1 where it was 100,000. I would like to see it stay at 200,000 or 300,000. Sure. The unemployment rate today is stable. But we did add jobs.

Mr. SARBANES. The Senator has to go back to March of this year to get the kind of job figures he is talking about.

Mr. SESSIONS. March of this year was just a few months ago. It is not as if it were 5 years ago.

Mr. SARBANES. The concern is that these job figures are coming down like this. It seems to me that the Senator has to face the fact that this is where the job figures have been trending over the last 6 months.

Mr. SESSIONS. We had—how many was it? I believe 240,000 jobs were created last month.

Mr. SARBANES. No.

Mr. SESSIONS. The month before last?

I reclaim the floor, Madam President. I was going to speak on another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama has the floor.

Mr. SARBANES. I would like to answer the question he just put to me.

Mr. SESSIONS. Maybe the Senator could read the last 3 or 4 months in job creation. Does he have them? There have been some pretty good months in there.

Mr. SARBANES. Not in the last 3 or 4 months, earlier in the year. Employment, again for the last 4 months, totaled 400,000 in the last 4 months. So it has averaged about 100,000 a month.

Mr. SESSIONS. It is better than what President Bush inherited from President Clinton.

Mr. SARBANES. He inherited a very strong economy in terms of the number of people who were working. And participation in the labor force was up very high. We broke records in terms of job production in the 1990s in the number of people we put to work.

Mr. SESSIONS. All right. Madam President, I will just say this: The economy was sinking when President Bush took office from President Clinton. And a sinking economy inevitably means you are going to have job losses, and that is what occurred. The President has turned this economy around. We have seen some robust growth in the last year. And we have created 2 million new jobs, as the Senator well knows, and we can debate that round

and round forever. I think the glass is at least half full. I guess the Senator is seeing it half empty.

STEM CELL RESEARCH

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I am going to speak about the stem cell research issue, which I think is important. I don't have an answer to it fully.

I so much admire Christopher Reeve, whose death we have noted today. His commitment to dealing with the terrible problem of spinal cord injury was a passion of his. We believe that stem cell research may well result in improvement, and hopefully even a cure for spinal injury. It is certainly something that I support. I know the President supports it. I think every Member of this body supports it.

I want to share a few thoughts.

Last night, Dr. BILL FRIST, our majority leader, who, as the Senate knows, is one of America's great doctors—he was a heart and lung transplant surgeon at the Vanderbilt University Medical School, and he is a highly trained and skilled physician. He discussed these issues last night and I entered into a little dialog with him on the floor of the Senate.

But in light of some of the comments that have been made today, I think it is appropriate that we at least get some perspective on this issue and try to get back to a rational discussion about it.

There are different types of stem cells. The one that causes some concern is the embryonic stem cell. If it is not destroyed and allowed to develop, it will become a human being. That embryo has within it its genetic makeup, the markers that will determine whether that person is tall or short, red hair or brunette, whatever the color of eyes and every other characteristic of that unique human being in that cell. It is a stunning, remarkable, marvelous miracle of life.

When we destroy that which is on the way to being a fully developed human person, I don't think anyone can say such destruction does not raise at least some moral and ethical dilemmas. Doesn't it raise some question about how we should be able to proceed in dealing with it? I make that point first.

It is not a matter of insignificance, the concerns raised here, when we deal with an embryo that, if allowed to develop, would be a human person.

Senator FRIST laid it out well last night. He quoted Senator KERRY in the debate as criticizing President Bush for imposing a "sweeping ban" on stem cell research. We had Senators this afternoon say President Bush's policy would "close the door" on stem cell research. Senator FRIST said as a physician, putting on his physician robes, he said that this is a cruel thing to say to patients who are ill and dying, and it is just not true.

Senator KERRY knows it is not true. His comments are an attempt to make

something out of nothing and to misrepresent the position of the President and this Congress on this issue. It is not true that the President wants to stop stem cell research.

Let me say where we are, as I understand it. People can agree or disagree with the policies. I agree with the policies.

First, there are what we call adult stem cells. These come from bone marrow and other parts of the human anatomy. President Bush has increased substantially the funding for adult stem cell research. We have made some medical progress in various diseases, including diabetes, using adult stem cell research. We are spending more money than we have ever spent on it, and we all support that. Private research is also ongoing on adult stem cell research.

Then there are the embryonic stem cell research issues that raise these moral and ethical questions. I don't claim to have the answer to all the concerns.

I remember the 100th Psalm that says, Without our aid he did us make. Or the Declaration of Independence says, We are created equal. If you believe we are created beings and that there is a sacredness to life, anybody ought to have at least some concern about this question of creating a human being in the making and then destroying that to carry out research matters.

It is a matter that deserves serious moral and ethical discussion. I don't think we respect life very much if we lightly move into this area without any limitations.

There are stem cell lines that have already been created from embryos that have been killed and destroyed, in effect, in their capability of becoming human, and those cell lines continue to produce today. There are 26 or more lines producing on a regular basis—embryonic stem cells—and Federal funding is allowed for that. Those that we have already done—and the President considered it carefully and thoughtfully, saying, well, we cannot go back and reverse that—let's go ahead and allow the research to go forward in that area.

In addition, I note there are no bans whatever on stem cell research. The question has simply been whether we will take Federal tax money and spend it on embryonic stem cell research. That has been the discussion on how we are going to do it. President Bush said we will do it for the existing lines but we will not take taxpayers' money and destroy life to do an experiment.

Universities, private labs, and hospitals, can all freely conduct scientific research on embryonic stem cells. It is not against the law. It is not prohibited. It is simply that we are not going to have the taxpayers—many people have strong feelings about this life issue—to take that money and fund it. It is appropriate to recognize this ethical issue and to show this small bit of

respect for this marvelous, unique, sacred bit of life that is the beginning of a human person. I don't think we ought to be spending taxpayer money on it.

Dr. Frist explained last night only adult stem cell research today has shown progress in medical research. The embryonic stem cells have not. Senator Sam Brownback has talked about this. He said scientists are finding that the embryonic stem cell tends to be volatile and not as capable of being utilized in a therapeutic way as adult stem cells. Regardless of how it may turn out in the future, that appears to be the state of the science today.

So we are putting the tax money into the areas that not only do not raise ethical questions but have the most proven success in making therapeutic breakthroughs.

We are not slamming the door or closing the door on stem cell research. We do not have, as Senator KERRY falsely stated in the debate, a sweeping ban on stem cell research. That is not true. He ought not to have said that. He knows better. He is trying to scare people. It is a cruel thing for people out there with illnesses today who think there is a ban and that they cannot be helped with research from stem cells. There is unprecedented research in the stem cell area. We are going to continue that.

I don't know the answers. I am not a physician or scientist. Is there nothing we won't prohibit in the name of science or research?

I am familiar, from my home State of Alabama, with the research done on syphilis that left people infected so they could study them, and compare them to people who were treated for syphilis. We now know that was wrong.

We, in this country, have believed by a substantial majority that cloning human beings is not right and should not be done. We certainly have all seen the rejections of Nazi Germany's abuses of science. As a society and a nation, there ought to be some limit on what we can allow or should allow. People should be able to talk about it and wrestle with it and Congress ought to act on it. If there is serious doubt about one phase of scientific research, maybe it is perfectly appropriate that taxpayers not be required to fund that because when the Government funds it, there is a governmental and societal affirmation that this is a good and healthy way to operate. We should work on these issues very carefully.

I close with these thoughts. In the history of the world, no nation has invested so much in its effort to cure disease as this Nation. I have been pleased and proud of this Congress since I have been here 7, 8 years now, that we promised several years ago to double the funding for the National Institutes of Health. We have met that goal.

We have had tremendous increases in spending for the National Institutes of Health which is where our research money goes. For the most part, we