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

inclusive approaches to addressing the issues of forest management.

The administration has now made the right decision on Eagle Creek. It is time to halt the destructive practice of salvage sales around this country.

I look forward to working on a bipartisan basis with our colleagues and with the Secretary of Agriculture to promote a balanced forest policy that protects the remaining old growth in our national forests.

I yield the floor.

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. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CLINTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I advise Members that we are now working on a unanimous consent agreement to have a vote at probably about a quarter to 3 today. We should have something on that as soon as the Senator from California completes her speech. I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended until we recess today at 12:30.

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

The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business for the next half hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, it has become very clear to me and to others that the linchpin of stabilizing the Middle East and also to developing an allied coalition of Arab nations in the war on terrorism is the resolution of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Unfortunately, in the past 2 weeks, while Congress has been on recess, we have seen an escalation of violence. I strongly believe that Yasser Arafat must shut down the suicide bombers or there will be no opportunity for peace in the Middle East.

The Crown Prince of Saudi Arabia expressed a vision for a peace plan. Secretary Powell is in the area to see if he can capitalize on this vision and restore peace and stability, at least to get a cease-fire. His job is, indeed, a difficult one.

The suicide bombings are a potent weapon and they have been precisely calculated to destroy any chance for peace. Again, why? If these suicide bombers cannot be stopped, the situation can only deteriorate and the result will only be full scale military conflagration.

Israel cannot be expected to place a limit on her own self-defense or end her effort to capture terrorists so long as fanatics on the Palestinian side continue to plot and carry out these attacks.

Indeed, some 30 years ago, I recall hearing former Israeli Prime Minister Golda Meir say:

> We are not going to die so the world will think well of us.

An overwhelming majority of the Israeli people still feel the same and believe as I do that Israel has a legitimate right to self-defense.

Forces under the control of Yasser Arafat have been directly involved in perpetrating the recent wave of deadly terrorist attacks against Israeli civilians. Many of these attacks have been carried out by Arafat-affiliated groups such as the Al Aqsa Brigade, recently designated by the State Department as a foreign terrorist organization, and the Tanzim. These are parts of his own military apparatus.

During the week of Passover, 46 Israelis were killed and more than 120 wounded. In March alone, 125 Israelis were killed in the attacks which culminated in the bombing of the Passover ceremony in Netanya.

According to documents recently seized by the Israeli military from Palestinian Authority headquarters, one of Arafat's top advisers who works out of his office is directly involved in financing the illegal weapons purchases and the terror activities of the Al Aqsa Brigade. This same Palestinian Authority was directly involved in efforts to illegally smuggle in more than 50 tons of arms from Iran a few months ago.

Arafat resumed using terror as a tactic after he walked away from Israel's historic peace concessions at Camp David in 2000. The offer placed on the table at Camp David may not have been perfect, although I happen to believe it was excellent, giving the Palestinians 96 percent of what they wanted. They have not put an offer on the table. Rather, they have opted for violence.

Since the fall of 2000, Arafat and his forces have engaged in hundreds of acts of terror against Israel, principally targeted at civilians. Arafat and other Palestinian officials have been directly involved in inciting violence against Israel. Arafat and other Palestinian officials have been directly involved in failing to thwart terrorist operations because they know how powerful those operations are.

Arafat and other Palestinian Authority officials have been directly involved in releasing terrorist suspects rather than arresting them. Arafat and other Palestinian Authority officials have been directly involved in failing to confiscate the weapons of terrorist suspects.

All of these actions are required under the terms of peace agreements he signed and to which he claims to be still committed. So why is all of this happening? I believe there is a hidden agenda, and that hidden agenda is to drive out the Jewish people and create a Palestinian state, which includes Israel. This has been the Palestinians' historic quest. Many of us hoped that through the Oslo process this quest could have been changed. But I am increasingly beginning to believe it has not been changed.

It may be unreasonable to expect that Arafat will be 100 percent successful in bringing Hamas and the Islamic Jihad totally under his control. But he can control Fatah and the Al Aqsa brigades and the Tanzim. So far, it is impossible to make the argument that he has even tried. We must remember that Yasser Arafat has rejected all Israeli peace plans, and he rejected General Zinni's recent cease-fire plan, which Israel accepted.

General Zinni went to the Palestinians and said: What do you need? He then went to the Israelis and said: What do you need? He then put them together and presented each with a cease-fire plan. The Israelis accepted it; the Palestinians did not. So one must believe the Palestinians could stop this violence if they wanted.

Israeli soldiers are now going door to door. If they retreat, I believe it will be back to the suicide bombing as usual. In the past 2 weeks, there have been no suicide bombings, since the last bombing on March 31 at the Haifa restaurant which killed 14 people. The Israeli Defense Forces, IDF, have arrested roughly 1,500 people and placed 500 on the wanted list. The Israeli Defense Forces have captured more than 2,000 weapons of various types, including thousands of guns and ammunition, 44 combat vests and suicide belts, more than 60 pounds of high explosives, and nearly 50 rocket-propelled grenades and launchers. They have captured night vision equipment and sniper rifles. The IDF has also discovered 11 weapons and explosives laboratories.

In the final analysis, if there is to be a peaceful resolution of the crisis, and if there is to be a Palestinian state alongside Israel, Mr. Arafat must make every effort to take the measures necessary to bring the suicide bombing and this kind of violence to an end. That is the responsibility he bears as a leader if he wants to see his people truly live in peace and freedom.

If Secretary Powell is unable to make concrete progress in ending the violence and moving the peace process forward, I intend to move forward shortly on an updated version of the Middle East peace compliance legislation that I introduced with Senator MCCONNELL last fall.

The stakes are enormous. As an editorial last Thursday in the Washington Post—and I find myself strongly agreeing—stated:

> It should not be hard to agree that a person who detonates himself in a pizza parlor or a discotheque filled with children, spraying scrap metal and nails in an effort to kill and maim as many of them as possible, has