

is not as inconvenienced as those of us who are not in the leadership because they have offices here in the Capitol. But speaking for those of us who have been dispossessed for 5, going on 6 weeks, and every indication is another week or another 2 weeks, we do not seem to be able to get a conclusive decision on when we can get in, when they are going to be satisfied it is through—and somebody is going to have to sign off on this.

It seems to me they could simply seal off the office now that is demanding their attention, seal off that air-conditioning or cut that off mechanically—you can do it—and let us get into our offices so we can function. It is extraordinarily inconvenient. You can imagine walking out of your office and just having to leave everything there.

But the worst part of it is we had been in that building 3 full days, operating, after the envelope was opened in Senator DASCHLE's office.

So I urge those responsible to get together and, for Heavens' sakes, find a way to get us back into the rest of the building. If you have to seal Senator TOM DASCHLE's office, then go ahead and do it and get it completed.

I yield the floor to my good friend from Kansas. He and I are going to be with you for a while.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senator BROWNBACk from Kansas is recognized.

#### DAY OF RECONCILIATION

Mr. BROWNBACk. Mr. President, I appreciate the time to be able to address the body on a key issue we will be taking up for a vote on Monday. Before I do that, I would like to make an announcement of an activity in which the Presiding Officer and I have been directly involved. On December 4, Tuesday this next week, from 5 to 7, it is going to be a day of reconciliation, a time period in the Rotunda for Members of both the House and Senate sides. This is going to be a time for the leaders of the country to get together and pray for the Nation. It is going to be December 4, 5 to 7 p.m., just the leaders of the House, Senate, and administration. It will not be open to the public. I do hope Members can attend and be a part of that process and that ceremony. It is something the country used to do frequently and hasn't for a number of years. That will be December 4, 5 to 7 p.m., in the Rotunda.

#### ISSUES IN THE LOTT AMENDMENT

Mr. BROWNBACk. Mr. President, I would like to take a few minutes to speak in morning business on the issue of human cloning. On Monday, there will be a vote on the issue of the Lott amendment that contains the energy package that has been put forward by Senator MURKOWSKI, and the moratorium on human cloning, the 6-month

moratorium on human cloning that I put forward. Several colleagues have sponsored both of these amendments. It has been put together. There will be a cloture vote on this on Monday.

I am asking our colleagues to support us being able to get this issue before the body for a final vote, to vote for cloture on the Lott amendment so we can get this issue in front of the body and get it decided.

These are two critical issues. The issue of energy and our dependence on foreign oil sources is becoming more and more obvious to people around the country and around the world. We are just too dependent on other places, places that are not reliable suppliers to the United States.

Oil from Iraq, as Senator MURKOWSKI has talked about frequently, is certainly not a reliable supply to the United States. Yet we are dependent on it. There are growing questions about Saudi Arabia, about the reliability of Saudi Arabia and the oil resources from there. Clearly, we should be having an energy policy and an energy strategy to remove ourselves from some of the dependency, particularly in the Persian Gulf region, for our oil and natural gas supplies. We need to do this energy policy, and do it now.

#### HUMAN CLONING

Mr. BROWNBACk. Mr. President, I wish to particularly address the issue of human cloning and the part of the bill that puts forth a 6-month moratorium on human cloning. I brought up before this body several times this week a U.S. News & World Report cover story of this week about the first human clone. Advanced Cell Technology out of Massachusetts is now saying they have cloned the first human being.

We have to address this issue now or we are going to have to expect more stories such as this about the further development of human cloning before this body has spoken. The House has spoken and said they don't want to have human clones. They put forth a complete ban, and passed it by a large bipartisan majority, a 100-vote margin. The President said: Let's ban human cloning. We don't want to create humans for destructive purposes or for reproductive purposes in this fashion. He has asked for banning that. This body has failed to act.

That is why we are putting forward at this time this request for a 6-month moratorium: Time out; hold up, so we don't have moratoriums such as this while this body takes time to deliberate, hold the committee hearings, and do the things it needs to do to consider this issue. We are asking for a timeout moratorium for 6 months.

I want to make several points and cite various groups that are supporting the moratorium or even the entire ban-

ning of human cloning. I want to read some important articles which they have put forward. I will make several points over the following days, weeks, and months.

One point is that research cloning being sponsored by Advanced Cell Technology requires eggs to be harvested from a woman. Harvesting eggs is an invasive and dangerous procedure. Harvesting eggs from women means the use of super-ovulatory drugs, the 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 CONCERNS

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