

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

allow physicians and scientific experts to say how that money is spent, what diseases have the best chance of being cured, what experiments going on out there have the greatest opportunity for breakthrough. We don't try to micromanage that. In general, that is good and I support that.

There are things we as a society can speak about. We are not denying people hope. It would be terribly wrong to suggest what is going on as a policy in our Congress and in our Government is denying people hope that medical breakthroughs can occur from stem cells.

We are going to continue unprecedented Federal spending. We will continue unprecedented private spending on stem cells. We will spend Federal money on embryonic stem cells and Federal money on adult stem cells. Who knows, some of those may result in great breakthroughs that will help prolong the life and health of millions of American people and not just in America but the whole world.

This Nation, through our investment in scientific research, has lifted and improved the lives of people all over the world. It is something that we can take pride in as a people. It is something for which I am proud. I want to continue to see it developed.

As we go forward, as we continue to debate these ethical and moral matters, as we continue to see the improvements in science and learn more from science, we may adjust and be able to come up with different ideas as we go forward on stem cell research. Who knows what we will learn as time goes forward.

Based on what I understand today, I see no reason in science, I see no reason in ethics—that requires that we blindly go in and destroy life for scientific experimentation when there is no clear indication that experimentation will result in health benefits to American people.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CORNYN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### A MILITARY DRAFT

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, whenever I travel in Iowa, I hear moms and dads worrying out loud that if President Bush gets a second term, he intends to reinstitute the military draft. I hear the same thing from college-aged Iowans. In fact, a national poll of young people found that 55 percent expect the draft to be started up again. Of course, the joke that is going around is: President Bush insists that there will be no draft. And if anybody

knows how to avoid a draft, it is George W. Bush.

But the facts tell a different story. The facts tell us that if President Bush continues on his current course, he will have to reinstitute the draft. In fact, to meet personnel needs in Iraq, President Bush has already imposed stage one of a new draft. Many soldiers whose enlistment time is up are not being allowed to leave the service, and people who left the service years ago are being forced to put on the uniform again against their will. So we already have a backdoor draft. Let's be honest about it. President Bush has already done away with the All-Volunteer military. Stage two of the reinstated draft would be easy to implement. Draft boards are already in place in every county in America. Young men who turn age 18 are already required to register with their local draft board. It is becoming increasingly obvious that because of President Bush's new doctrine of preemptive war, our military is stretched dangerously thin. We do not have enough people in uniform to meet current needs in Iraq and Afghanistan, much less to deal with a confrontation with Iran or North Korea or some other hot spot.

Here are the hard realities that cannot be ignored. Right now, total Active Army and Marine personnel number about 655,000. That includes support units, training units, headquarters personnel, and others who do not see combat.

In a long, drawn out war such as a Vietnam or an Iraq, units sent to the front lines have to be rotated out periodically and replaced by an equal number of forces. Now, currently, we have 135,000 troops in Iraq, 20,000 in Afghanistan, 36,000 in Korea, more than 100,000 in Europe, and some various troops scattered in Japan and Okinawa and a few other places.

Our Armed Forces have been stretched and strained to the breaking point. To fill the gaps and shortages, tens of thousands of guardsmen and women reservists have been called up, some for several years at a time. But there is a cost to all of this. Morale is suffering. Enlistments and reenlistments are down. The Army National Guard fell 10-percent short of its 2004 recruiting goal. The Regular Army has had to ease up on standards in order to meet its recruitment goals.

Now, what happens if all-out civil war breaks out in Iraq and we have to increase our troop strength to 200,000 or 300,000 to quell it? What happens if a newly reelected President Bush decides it is time for a preemptive war against Iran or Syria or North Korea?

President Bush has already effectively ended the All-Volunteer military. People are hesitant to join the Guard or Reserve because the odds of being sent into combat have skyrocketed.

So how in the world would a second-term President Bush meet the personnel needs of his doctrine of preemp-

tive war? Bear in mind, President Bush has changed the standard for justifying preemptive war.

As the New York Times reported on Sunday, originally the criterion was that a rogue nation was an imminent threat to us, that it either possessed weapons of mass destruction or was actively attempting to build these weapons of mass destruction. But in response to the Duelfer report last week, which found no weapons of mass destruction stockpiles and no active program to produce these weapons in Iraq, President Bush says that does not matter. He said that a preemptive invasion is justified if an enemy is trying to avoid United Nations sanctions by "gaming the system," as the President put it.

As the New York Times concluded:

Mr. Bush appears to be saying that under his new standard a country merely has to be thinking about developing illicit weapons at some time.

Or as Joseph Nye of Harvard concludes:

The President is saying that intent is enough.

Well, given either the old or the new standard for justifying preemption, the U.S. military is going to be very busy indeed if President Bush is reelected. Our military personnel needs will grow dramatically as morale, enlistments, and reenlistments fall. That is exactly why I have taken the floor today, to state this: That I believe President Bush intends to reinstate the draft. Why can I say that? Because he has no choice. To pursue his agenda of aggressive preemption, he must reinstate the draft.

Now, if you look at history, incumbent Presidents never reveal their true intentions on matters of war and the draft. Those of us who were around in the 1960s remember President Lyndon Johnson, a President of my own party. When he was running for election in 1964, people were afraid he had a secret plan to escalate the war in Vietnam. He denied it. President Johnson repeatedly promised: I will not send American boys halfway around the world to do a job that Asian boys ought to be doing for themselves.

Well, Mr. Johnson was reelected and, sure enough, millions of American boys were drafted and sent halfway around the world to Vietnam.

So young people today have good reasons for fearing the draft. They have good reasons for not believing President Bush's reassurances that he has no intention of reinstituting the draft. After all, President Bush has quite a lengthy track record of saying one thing and doing exactly the opposite. Well, I guess there is some kind of a technical term for this. I guess it is called: Flip-flopping.

Remember, as a candidate in 2000, President Bush was for a "humble foreign policy" before he was against it. He was against nation building in foreign countries before he was for it. He was for a peaceful resolution of the