

see again. Times change, things change. My hope is the President will understand this is a very serious problem and will relent and decide he wants to help.

I am informing the chairman and ranking member of the full Appropriations Committee today that it is my intention to modify the amendment I added to the Agriculture appropriations bill to include the 2006 drought because we must, it seems to me, respond to this disaster. The failure to respond to it means that fewer and fewer people will be living out on the land in this country, and that takes something significant away from the character of this country. This is not new. We have always reached out in times of trouble.

I would ask anybody who thinks there is not trouble out there to just take a drive—take a drive in the drought area and then ask yourself, if you had 300 cows that were your responsibility on your ranch, what on Earth would you feed them? And if there is nothing to feed them, you are going to market and you are out of business. It is that simple.

So, first and foremost, my colleague, Senator CONRAD, and I, and others, have asked the Secretary of Agriculture to release haying and grazing opportunities on CRP lands. That is very important. It is important that it be done now, not later. The Department of Agriculture always drags its feet and always opens CRP land for haying and grazing too late, after the major 4-H opportunities are gone or after the 4-H capability is dramatically diminished. So my hope is that the Secretary of Agriculture will heed the call this time and open that land for haying and grazing immediately to give some relief to those ranchers.

As I said, this is not just about North Dakota. My colleague, Senator BOND from Missouri, and our colleagues from Illinois and others—Illinois, last year, had the third driest year since 1895. There are other areas of this country that are suffering the ravages of drought. Again, my hope is that this Congress will understand the urgency.

I was at this meeting in Zealand, ND, of 170 ranchers. They talked about the drought. Even without the drought, what is happening to them, the average farmer and rancher in North Dakota is spending \$18,000 a year in additional energy costs. The big, major integrated oil companies are walking to the bank with bundles of money sucked right out of the pocketbooks of working Americans, ranchers, and farmers, especially because they are heavy users of energy. It is unbelievable the toll it is imposing all across this country. But when you add a drought, which has destroyed pastures and destroyed the ability to feed your cattle, and then continue to impose this additional burden of energy costs, in my judgment, it is a recipe for destruction all across rural America.

Some people may think it doesn't matter. I have spoken before to my col-

leagues about a fellow named Rodney Nelson in North Dakota who is a cowboy poet and who wrote a long question for this country: Does part of this country's character depend on having folks on the farm and on the ranch as well? Farmers and ranchers, small towns and big towns, isn't all of that together part of the character of this country? He asked the question: What is it worth? What is it worth for a kid to know how to weld a seam? What is it worth for a kid to know how to overhaul a tractor, how to plow a straight furrow, how to teach a calf to suck from a pail? What is it worth for a kid to know all of these things? What is it worth for a kid to know how to grease a combine, how to hang a door, how to build a lean-to? What is it worth?

There is only one university in this country where that is taught and that is on the family farm. Those kids who come off our farms and go to small towns and big cities, who bring with them that nourishment of family values from America's farms and ranches to small towns and big cities is what renews our country. If this Congress ever decides that farms don't matter, those Americans who live out under a yard light trying to raise a family and raise a crop and raise some livestock, if this Congress ever decides they don't matter, we will have lost something very substantial for this country.

So for now, we need the Secretary of Agriculture immediately to release CRP land for haying and grazing so we can get some feed to those cattle in drought areas. No. 1. No. 2, we need this President to back away from his threat to veto disaster aid, and we need to amend the provision that I put in the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee to extend it to 2006, which I intend to do.

Mr. President, we have a lot of choices to make in this country. Our country has a responsibility in this world to respond to all kinds of things. We are a world leader. I think that it is important for us to respond around the world. But first and foremost, it is important for us to respond here at home and take care of things here at home.

I am just telling you when the sign at the bank and the sign downtown in your town shows 105 degrees or 102 degrees and the wind is blowing 30 miles an hour and the pasture looks like a bowling ball and there is nothing for the cattle to eat and you are suffering through a drought, this Congress has a responsibility to act—and sooner rather than later.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

SUPREME COURT DECISION REGARDING TERRORISTS

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I will take the first 10 minutes to speak about the recent Supreme Court decision on the treatment of terrorists we are holding and their rights relative to trial. This is a classic example of a court that has seen the trees but has failed to see the forest.

We are confronted with a situation where individuals, whose purpose it is to kill Americans and destroy our Nation, are being held by our country in order to protect our country. These are individuals who don't function as part of an organized nation. There is no Nation to which they are accountable or which would be accountable to us should we be functioning in a state of war that was formal, such as occurred during World War II when the Nazi government and Germany and the German soldiers that were captured were held under the rules of the Geneva Convention and the people who were in that government were tried under the rules of Nuremberg. There is no such government. These individuals function separately from any formal structure that could be called governance. And there is no right to the Geneva Convention because the Geneva Convention presumes certain statuses of combat and that there are certain engagements, even though it is in war, that have rules relative to what can and should be done in a war that is appropriate.

None of these people are signatories to the Geneva Convention; they have no rights under the Geneva Convention; and they disavow the purposes of the Geneva Convention. Their purpose is to kill for the reason that they believe their life will be improved and their afterlife, as they see it in their perverse view of Islam—which is a great religion but is being perverted by these fundamentalists. Their purpose is to kill Americans and destroy Western culture. To ascribe to them certain rights, as if they were citizens of our Nation or citizens of some other nation that we were at war with, or as if they were participants in a group that was signatory to the Geneva Convention, is to undermine, first, the legitimacy of nations and what nations stand for; and, secondly, the legitimacy of treaties and what treaties stand for because you are essentially ascribing to these people rights and values which they reject and which they are fighting against.

Their purpose is to not support the Constitution or be governed by the Constitution of America. Their purpose is to destroy America and the Constitution. Their purpose is not to support the government of whatever Islamic nation they come from. Their purpose is, in most instances, to take that government over and to establish a religiously fundamentalist state which isn't governed at all by rules of Western or traditional civil societies. And their purpose certainly isn't to subscribe to the Geneva Convention.

So when the Supreme Court made this decision, they found themselves focusing on the trees but not on the forest. We have to ask ourselves why. Why would the Court make this decision? Well, maybe their purpose was to force us, as a Congress, to clarify the role of the President, and if that is the case, then we should do it. We should act in a way that gives the President the authority to hold these individuals because, what is the option? What is the option, to not hold them? That is not an option.

If you release these individuals, you basically assure yourself that you are releasing people whose purpose it is to come back and do dramatic harm to our Nation and to Americans. What President—what President—who is sworn to uphold the Constitution and to protect this country, could possibly release these individuals in the context of what their purpose is? It would totally—totally—affront the responsibility of the Presidency to do that.

The Court has made a decision which makes no sense from the standpoint of reality, although it may make sense from the standpoint of theory. I believe the Congress needs to act, and act quickly, so that this type of error can be corrected. It is, after all, a branch of Government that is not infallible—the Supreme Court. They have made egregious mistakes in the past such as in the Dred Scott case. And so we need to correct that and correct it promptly. We are an equal branch of Government. We have the capacity in this instance to correct it, it appears, at least from the dictum, if not from the actual core of the opinion. So we should do that. I would hope that the Congress would act promptly.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are in morning business. The Senator is recognized.

STEM CELL RESEARCH

Mr. DORGAN. My understanding is that perhaps next week the Senate will take up something called stem cell research, several pieces of legislation dealing with stem cell research. I want to talk for a few moments about that issue.

It has been just over 1 year now since the U.S. House of Representatives has passed a piece of legislation called the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act, with very broad bipartisan support.

Those of us in the Senate and those across this country who have lost loved ones, and most of us have, to some dread disease—Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, heart disease, diabetes—the list is endless—cancer—understand that the urgency to do the research to find the cures for these diseases really must be preeminent.

I am not suggesting that urgency should suggest to us there are no ethical boundaries to research. There are ethical boundaries. But I also want to make certain that this Senate moves in a way that is expeditious and does the right thing.

I want to show a picture. This is a picture of a young girl I have met a good number of times. She is in the middle. Her name is Camille. Camille is 13. She was diagnosed with type 1 diabetes when she was 4 years old. I have met with Camille's mother and Camille a good number of times. I have told her story once before on the Senate floor, but it is worth retelling because Camille and her parents and so many others across this country are very concerned that we move forward on stem cell research and try to find ways to unlock the mysteries of this disease called juvenile diabetes. But not just diabetes; ALS and Parkinson's and Alzheimer's and so many more.

Type 1 diabetes, also called juvenile diabetes, occurs when a body's immune system attacks and destroys certain cells in the pancreas called beta cells. As a result, those beta cells that normally would produce insulin are not producing insulin. So when the beta cells are destroyed and no insulin is produced, the glucose stays in the blood and can cause serious damage to the organs of the body. So Camille, like many who have juvenile diabetes, will have to take insulin to stay alive. She has to maintain a carefully calculated diet. She checks her blood glucose level several times a day and takes insulin injections, as many as six a day, just to stay alive.

Her parents have told me about Camille and her schedule. They live by the clock. They wake up in the middle of the night every night to check on her, make sure her insulin levels are normal.

Every hour of every day in this country someone is diagnosed with type 1 diabetes. With Camille, she has had some very close calls. She has been in the hospital a great deal. Her diabetes has been pretty devastating, and she has had a lot of close calls.

This young girl and her parents really want Congress to move forward on stem cell research. There is so much promise in stem cell research. I want to describe why this is necessary. We are talking about human embryonic stem cell lines available for use in Federal research. In August of 2001 when the President said he will make lines available, he made 78 lines available. Now there are only 22 of those lines available and all of these approved lines are contaminated in certain ways.

That means that all of these stem cell lines will actually never be able to be used for human clinical trials.

This August 9, 2001 deadline that the President had on research using these 78 lines is simply an arbitrary deadline. Let me describe that these cells, these stem cell lines come from discarded embryos, fertilized eggs that have been cryogenically frozen at an in vitro fertilization clinic. We had a person testify before the Senate Commerce Committee some years ago who believed that it was just wrong that there should be eggs that are fertilized in a test tube or in a Petri dish and then implanted in the mother, something called in vitro fertilization. That is just wrong, he said. That should never ever have happened. It should never have been done.

There are now 1 million people living among us who were born as a result of in vitro fertilization, giving couples the ability to have children. Couples who previously have not been able to have children now are able to have children through in vitro fertilization.

At these in vitro clinics, more eggs are fertilized than are actually implanted and used. There are roughly 400,000 of embryos that are now cryogenically frozen at these clinics. Somewhere between 8,000 and 10,000 each year are simply discarded. They become waste. They are thrown away.

Those who say that the use of those embryos is the equivalent of murder, then, I believe, also probably say that the discarding of embryos that are not going to be used any longer, that have been cryogenically frozen—my guess is they believe those represent 8,000 or 10,000 murders a year.

I don't believe that. Those embryos can never and will never become a human being unless implanted into a uterus. The question is: Can we use these embryos to create stem cell lines to try to find cures to dread diseases? Here is what has happened in stem cell research since the President announced the limitation.

Here is what President Bush said in 2004:

Embryonic stem cell research requires the destruction of life. I'm the first President ever to allow Federal funding for embryonic stem cell research. I did so because I, too, hope that we'll discover cures from the stem cells. But we've got to be very careful in balancing the ethics and the science. And so I made the decision we wouldn't spend any more money beyond the 70 lines, 22 of which are now in action, because science is important, but so is ethics, so is balancing life.

But these lines themselves were from in vitro fertilization clinics and would have been discarded and are being discarded routinely in this country, 8,000 to 11,000 a year. This is just an arbitrary decision.

So let me just make a couple of additional points. This is my former colleague, Senator Jack Danforth, a former Republican colleague, as a matter of fact, and ordained Episcopal priest. He wrote this in the New York Times: