By Mrs. BOXER:

S. 1600. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to waive in the case of multiemployer plans the section 415 limit on benefits to the participant's average compensation for his high 3 years; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LOTT (for himself, Mr. BOND, Mr. FRIST, Mr. GREGG, Mr. NICKLES, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. HAGEL, and Mr. HUTCHINSON):

S. 1601. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the use of somatic cell nuclear transfer technology for purposes of human cloning; read the first time.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 1602. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit any attempt to clone a human being using somatic cell nuclear transfer and to prohibit the use of Federal funds for such purposes, to provide for further review of the ethical and scientific issues associated with the use of somatic cell nuclear transfer in human beings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. BROWNBACK (for himself and Mr. ROBB):

S. Res. 172. A resolution congratulating President Chandrika Bandaranaike Kumaratunga and the people of the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka on the celebration of 50 years of independence; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. LEVIN:

S. 1597. A bill to establish food safety research, education, and extension as priorities of the Department of Agriculture, to require the use of a designated team within the Department of Agriculture to enable the Department and other Federal agencies to rapidly respond to food safety emergencies, and to improve food safety through the development and commercialization of food safety technology; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

THE SAFE FOOD ACTION PLAN ACT

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, I am pleased to be introducing companion legislation to a bill prepared by Congresswoman DEBBIE STABENOW entitled the Safe Food Action Plan Act.

The bill adds food safety as a new statutory priority in the U.S. Department of Agriculture's research, education and extension programs. This should mean that more of the nearly $1.5 billion spent through existing grant and research programs, including the Fund for Rural America, will be focused directly on food safety. That's the kind of awareness that we need, to prevent and combat food supply contamination.

The bill also creates a Federal Emergency Management Agency-like approach to dealing with food safety crises. Currently, there are at least 3 agencies within the Department of Agriculture that have some responsibility for preventing and controlling outbreaks of food borne disease, not to mention the Food and Drug Administration and the Centers for Disease Control. This bill establishes a Food Safety Rapid Response Team across internal division boundaries within USDA that will coordinate with other Federal agencies. If outbreaks do occur, the American people must be confident that the government is prepared to efficiently handle and limit such public health threats.

This legislation was developed by Congresswoman STABENOW over several months with input from all parts of the food production and consumption chain and the Department of Agriculture. It is an excellent complement to the Administration's enforcement enhancement proposal. The Safe Food Action Plan is a sensible and cost-effective way to make the Federal government responsive and responsible.

I hope the Agriculture Committee will seek to move this legislation as quickly as possible, and I urge my colleagues to consider cosponsoring this important measure.

By Mr. BOND (for himself, Mr. FRIST, Mr. GREGG, Mr. LOTT, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. GRAMS and Mr. HAGEL):

S. 1599. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the use of somatic cell nuclear transfer technology for purposes of human cloning; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE HUMAN CLONING PROHIBITION ACT OF 1998

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, today, I rise to announce that we are introducing a measure that places an outright ban on the use of somatic cell nuclear transfer technology for human cloning purposes. Recent reports that a Chicago-based scientist is prepared to move forward with human cloning experimentation forces us to engage in an immediate debate on how far out on the moral cliff we are willing to let science proceed before we as a Nation insist on some meaningful constraints. When the announcement was made last month that these efforts to raise funds for human cloning were going forward, we stated that we would move on an emergency basis to deal with this and to express, through congressional action, a strong sense that this is unacceptable and we must prohibit it. I am pleased to be joined by the distinguished cosponsors, Senators FRIST, GREGG, LOTT, HUTCHISON, SHELBY, NICKLES, LUGAR, ABRAHAM, GRAMS, and HAGEL.

I believe we no longer have the luxury of waiting around for this morally reprehensible act to occur in the United States. Less than a year ago, the cloning of Dolly, the now famous sheep, provoked a debate of unprecedented proportions, a debate which to this day generates polar feelings of fascination and fear. We have in this body adopted prohibition on the use of Federal funds for research on or experimentation in human cloning. The time has come for us to make that a flat prohibition and to put our country in league with other civilized countries, which are saying human cloning is not acceptable and will not go forward.

Daily news accounts about the successful cloning of animals and stories of organizations and individuals pursuing human cloning have kept the debate alive. The American public is asking if similar techniques can be used to clone humans, and they are concerned whether something that was once thought only to be science fiction is now closer to becoming a reality.

Those opposing a prohibition on human cloning suggest that we cannot put the genie back in the bottle, and that we cannot stop progress. I suggest that in this case our technological capability may be outrunning our moral sense.

The ethical implications of human cloning are staggering. We should never create human life for spare parts, as a replacement for a child who has died, or for other unnatural and selfish purposes.

How many embryos or babies would we tolerate being created with abnormalities before we would perfect human cloning? It took Scottish scientists over 276 tries before they created Dolly, and we still do not even know if Dolly is the perfect sheep. What would have happened had those 276 been badly deformed potential humans? For humans, these results are entirely unacceptable. Dr. Ian Wilmut, the leading Scottish scientist who created Dolly, himself has stated that he can see no scenario under which it would be ethical to clone human life. I believe he is right.

Moreover, in September of 1994, a federal Human Embryo Research Panel noted that ''allowing society to create genetically identical persons would devalue human life by undermining the individuality of human beings.''

Further, the panel concluded that ''there are broad moral concerns about the deliberate duplication of an individual genome. The notion of cloning an existing human being or of making carbon copies of an existing embryo appears repugnant to members of the public. Many members of the panel share this view and see no justification for federal funding of such research.''

And I would emphatically argue that those statements apply to private sector research as well.

It is also important to note that this legislation is narrowly drafted, and it's sole objective is to ban the use of somatic cell nuclear transfer for human cloning purposes. We worked overtime to ensure that this language was specific so that it would only ban this technique which was used to create Dolly.

This technique has also been criticized by a representative of the pharmaceutical industry. In a prepared statement for members of Congress, dated January 13, 1998, the representative said,

While conventional cloning technology has been used extensively worldwide to meet global medical needs, nuclear transfer technology is fraught with untold failures for each partial success, and has major significant ethical issues associated with it. Furthermore, it has no strong therapeutic or economic based need driving it at this time. The concept that it is a viable alternative to infertile parents is cruel and completely unjustified. I would challenge you not to confuse the two as the Congress considers its options here.

In addition, our bill is straightforward and clear. It prevents a specific technology that is characterized by industry, researchers, theologians, ethicists, and others as ''fraught with failures and lacking therapeutic value.'' This bill, however, does allow important and promising research to continue.

In vitro fertilization research, plant and animal cloning, the cloning of DNA, cells and tissues, stem cell research, gene therapy research and other activities taking place at the Human Genome Center offer great hope in addressing how to prevent, diagnose, and treat many devastating diseases. And these types of research will continue to thrive.

I have long been a supporter of biotechnology; however, there is a bright line between those activities and human cloning. And we must draw that line.

The belief that all human beings are unique and created by God is shared by billions of us around the world. Human cloning, or man's attempt to play God, would change the very meaning of life, of human dignity, and of what it is to be human. Are we ready for that? Hardly.

I heard a profound statement from a leading bioethicist. He said, ''I have heard from many who wish they could be cloned, but I have never heard someone say that they wished they were a clone of someone else''—because cloning threatens human dignity, of what it means to be a unique individual.

There is a bright line between those activities—the legitimate activities and investigations to improve human life, to deal with the significant diseases that we have that might be ameliorated by technological research. We have to draw the line between legitimate research in medicine and human cloning.

Human cloning would devalue human life by undermining the individuality of human beings. We must show the moral courage and have the will to say no to human cloning.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1599

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Human Cloning Prohibition Act of 1998''.

SEC. 2. FINDING.

Congress finds that in order to prevent the creation of a cloned human individual through human somatic cell nuclear transfer technology, it is right and proper to prohibit the creation of cloned human embryos that would never have the opportunity for implantation and that would therefore be created solely for research that would ultimately lead to their destruction.

SEC. 3. PROHIBITION ON CLONING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after chapter 15, the following:

''CHAPTER 16—CLONING

''Sec.
''301. Prohibition on cloning.

''§ 301 Prohibition on cloning

''(a) IN GENERAL.—It shall be unlawful for any person or entity, public or private, in or affecting interstate commerce, to use human somatic cell nuclear transfer technology.

''(b) IMPORTATION.—It shall be unlawful for any person or entity, public or private, to import an embryo produced through human somatic cell nuclear transfer technology.

''(c) PENALTIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Any person or entity who is convicted of violating any provision of this section shall be fined according to the provisions of this title or sentenced to up to 10 years in prison, or both.

''(2) CIVIL PENALTY.—Any person or entity who is convicted of violating any provision of this section shall be subject to, in the case of a violation that involves the derivation of a pecuniary gain, a civil penalty of not more than an amount equal to the amount of the gross gain multiplied by 2.

''(d) DEFINITION.—The term 'human somatic cell nuclear transfer technology' means taking the nuclear material of a human somatic cell and incorporating it into an oocyte from which the nucleus has been removed or rendered inert and producing an embryo (including a preimplantation embryo).''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters for part I of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 15, the following:

''16. Cloning § 301''. .....

SEC. 4. COMMISSION TO PROMOTE A NATIONAL DIALOGUE ON BIOETHICS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established within the Institute of Medicine a commission to be known as the National Commission to Promote a National Dialogue on Bioethics (referred to in this section as the ''Commission'').

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.—The Commission shall be composed of 25 members, of whom—

(A) 6 shall be appointed by the Majority Leader of the Senate;

(B) 6 shall be appointed by the Minority Leader of the Senate;

(C) 6 shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and

(D) 6 shall be appointed by the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives; and

(E) 1, who shall serve as the Chairperson of the Commission, to be appointed jointly by the Majority Leader of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, in consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate and the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—Each individual described in subparagraph (A) through (D) of paragraph (1) shall ensure that members appointed to the Commission are representative of the fields of law, theology, philosophy or ethics, medicine, science, and society.

(3) DEADLINE FOR APPOINTMENT.—Members of the Commission shall be appointed by not later than December 1, 1998.

(4) TERMS OF APPOINTMENT.—A member of the Commission appointed under paragraph (1) shall serve for a term of 3 years. Members may not serve consecutive terms.

(5) MEETINGS.—The Commission shall meet at the call of its Chairperson or a majority of its members.

(6) QUORUM.—A quorum shall consist of 13 members of the Commission.

(7) VACANCIES.—A vacancy on the Commission shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made not later than 30 days after the Commission is given notice of the vacancy and shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the duties of the Commission.

(8) COMPENSATION.—Members of the Commission shall receive no additional pay, allowances, or benefits by reason of their service on the Commission.

(9) EXPENSES.—Each member of the Commission shall receive travel expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence in accordance with sections 5702 and 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

(c) DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION.—The Commission shall provide an independent forum for broad public participation and discourse concerning important bioethical issues including cloning, and provide for a report to Congress concerning the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the Commission concerning Federal policy and possible Congressional action.

(d) STAFF AND SUPPORT SERVICES.—

(1) STAFF.—With the approval of the Commission, the chairperson of the Commission may appoint such personnel as the chairperson considers appropriate.

(2) APPLICABILITY OF CIVIL SERVICE LAWS.—The staff of the Commission shall be appointed without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and shall be paid without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title (relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates).

(3) EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.—With the approval of the Commission, the chairperson may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code.

(4) PHYSICAL FACILITIES.—The Administrator of the General Services Administration shall locate suitable office space for the operation of the Commission. The facilities shall serve as the headquarters of the Commission and shall include all necessary equipment and incidentals required for the proper functioning of the Commission.

(e) POWERS OF COMMISSION.—

(1) HEARINGS AND OTHER ACTIVITIES.—For the purpose of carrying out its duties, the Commission may hold such public hearings and undertake such other activities as the Commission determines to be necessary to carry out its duties.

(2) DETAIL OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.—Upon the request of the Commission, the head of any Federal agency is authorized to detail, without reimbursement, any of the personnel of such agency to the Commission to assist the Commission in carrying out its duties. Any such detail shall not interrupt or otherwise affect the civil service status or privileges of the Federal employee.

(3) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—Upon the request of the Commission, the head of a Federal agency shall provide such technical assistance to the Commission as the Commission determines to be necessary to carry out its duties.

(4) USE OF MAILS.—The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as Federal agencies and shall, for purposes of the frank, be considered a commission of Congress as described in section 3215 of title 39, United States Code.

(5) OBTAINING INFORMATION.—The Commission may secure directly from any Federal agency information necessary to enable it to carry out its duties, if the information may be disclosed under section 552 of title 5, United States Code. Upon request of the Chairperson of the Commission, the head of such agency shall furnish such information to the Commission.

(6) ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT SERVICES.—Upon the request of the Commission, the Administrator of General Services shall provide to the Commission on a reimbursable basis such administrative support services as the Commission may request.

(7) PRINTING.—For purposes of costs relating to printing and binding, including the cost of personnel detailed from the Government Printing Office, the Commission shall be deemed to be a committee of the Congress.

(f) SUBCOMMITTEES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall establish 6 subcommittees, including—

(A) a subcommittee on legal issues;

(B) a subcommittee on theological issues;

(C) a subcommittee on philosophical and ethical issues;

(D) a subcommittee on medical issues;

(E) a subcommittee on scientific issues; and

(F) a subcommittee on social issues.

(2) MEMBERSHIP.—With respect to the issues for which each subcommittee has been established, each subcommittee shall be composed of—

(A) 1 expert to be appointed by the members of the Committee who were appointed under subparagraphs (A) and (C) of subsection (b)(1);

(B) 1 expert to be appointed by the members of the Committee who were appointed under subparagraphs (B) and (D) of subsection (b)(1);

(C) 1 individual operating in the private sector who is acquainted with the issues but who is not an expert to be appointed by the members of the Committee who were appointed under subparagraphs (A) and (C) of subsection (b)(1);

(D) 1 individual operating in the private sector who is acquainted with the issues but who is not an expert to be appointed by the members of the Committee who were appointed under subparagraphs (B) and (D) of subsection (b)(1); and

(E) 4 members of the Commission with relevant expertise.

(3) MEETINGS.—Meetings of the subcommittees shall be approved by the Commission.

(g) REPORT.—Not later than December 31, 1999, and annually thereafter, the Commission shall prepare and submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report which shall contain a detailed statement of the recommendations, findings, and conclusions of the Commission.

(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

SEC. 5. UNRESTRICTED SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH.

Nothing in this Act (or an amendment made by this Act) shall be construed to restrict areas of scientific research that are not specifically prohibited by this Act (or amendments).

SEC. 6. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that the Federal Government should advocate for and join an international effort to prohibit the use of human somatic cell nuclear transfer technology to produce a human embryo.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I now yield to my distinguished colleague from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I rise to support both the intent and to underscore the importance of this bill, the Bond-Frist-Gregg bill, which does address the issue of human cloning. The purpose of this bill is very straightforward, and that is to prohibit human cloning while at the same time protecting very important scientific research.

This bill does prohibit human cloning, a topic which has captured the imagination of not only the American people but really the world over the past year after the successful experiment by Ian Wilmut, the Scottish scientist who successfully cloned ''Dolly,'' an adult sheep, using a new technique, a technique called somatic cell nuclear transfer. Public sentiment in response immediately registered, and I think appropriately so, opposition to the application of this specific technique to human beings. Fears that the ''Dolly'' experiment might lead to asexual human reproduction nearly drowned out pleas from the scientific community to protect legitimate cloning research at the cellular and animal level.

Congress responded to the public fear by enacting a ban on the Federal funding for any human cloning research at the embryo level, and the President soon after issued an Executive order forbidding implantation of a cloned human embryo with the use of Federal funds.

Scientists in the private sector have been left unregulated, but most research societies, appropriately I believe, adopted a voluntary moratorium on the use of somatic cell technology for the purpose of human cloning.

Since no imminent threat of human clones at the time was perceived, the issue took a back seat to the more visible items before the Congress and the country, such as balancing the Federal budget. With the exception of an occasional television show, movie or news report, cloning pretty much faded from the mental radar screen of most Americans. But then not too long ago Dr. Seed gave new life to the whole human cloning debate when he announced in a public way his intention to use the Wilmut technique to create a cloned human individual.

At that time it very quickly became apparent to virtually everyone that without Federal legislation human cloning could, and many feel would, occur in the private sector without due consideration to the ethical, social, theological and medical implications of this new and unproved technique.

Our collective instinct that human individuals should not now be cloned has its roots in the most basic feelings we have about human nature. We know that an individual is more than the sum of individual body parts, more than the sum of the various organs, and we know instinctively that the human spirit, no matter how hard we try or how good the science is, cannot be replicated. The science of somatic cell nuclear transfer is still today imperfect. Wilmut's technique can be dangerous, we know, to the cloned child. In addition, we have no idea about the long-term effects of asexual reproduction on the human gene pool or on the psychosocial structures of our world.

Quite simply, we are not prepared for a human ''Dolly'' experiment. And our inability to respond adequately to the moral, the ethical and the theological implications of this technology has highlighted a serious weakness in the fabric of our social structure. In too many instances we have allowed ourselves to separate scientific progress from those ethical conversations. We no longer can divorce the two. Dr. Seed and others have forced us to confront our deficits and to fashion timely answers to the timeless question: ''Is there a line that should not be crossed even for scientific or other gain, and if so, where is it?'' I have used that line in this Chamber before. It is from a Washington Post editorial in October of 1994: ''Is there a line that should not be crossed even for scientific or other gain, and if so, where is it?''

The debate on this particular bill, and others that address the issue of cloning, will have to center around that question, where is that line?

I have a research background. I am a research scientist. I am a transplant physician. I am committed to the public welfare through that public service of medicine and science. From that background, I personally would use four principles that I think must, in my view, be a part of any legislation as we embark on prohibiting human cloning. First, legislation must differentiate between human cloning on the one hand and animal, cellular and molecular and plant cloning on the other. It is that human dimension we must address and address very specifically in order not to halt the progress of science in those other fields.

The second principle. The legislation must be crafted very specifically with surgical precision, with laser-like precision, narrowly, yes, so that we will avoid inadvertently banning other nontargeted research, research that is critically important to improving health care for the current generation as well as that next generation, important research that we must protect in terms of stem cell research, in vitro fertilization, our search for cures of juvenile diabetes, our attack on prevention and cure of cancer.

The third principle that I would encourage my colleagues to adopt as we

embark upon this banning of human cloning is that the legislation must prevent the specific technique of somatic cell nuclear transfer, the specific technique, because of its potential to facilitate the mass production of cloned human embryos that could be created solely for research and ultimately destroyed.

Fourth, the legislation must include the creation of a new permanent bipartisan commission that is representative of the American people, representative of science, representative of our ethical thinking, representative of theology, so that we can more adequately address in a sophisticated, mature way, consistent with the science and ethical thinking of today, the many issues that are going to face us in this arena of bioethics, this rapidly oncoming onslaught of science, and very good science as we look to the future. Science is critically important as we learn better to address the ravages of disease.

Two temptations threaten both science and ethics in the current environment. On the one hand, we have the pressure on legislators, often unfamiliar with the specifics of scientific issues, to rush out and draft laws that could hamper important research efforts if we are not very careful. And on the other hand, almost in parallel, is this tendency on the part of some scientists to say, no, we don't need that type of intervention, that type of oversight of ethics, of laws. Thus we have science and we have ethics that are almost lost in this political morass and the public meanwhile stays outside, all too often frightened, uninvolved, and unengaged.

This cloning debate, I think, maybe for the first time in the history of this body, forces us to address what is inevitable as we look to the future, and that is a rapid-fire, one-after-another onslaught of new scientific technological innovation that has to be assimilated into our ethical-social fabric.

Thus, this bioethics commission is important to consider these future innovations as they come forward. Right now there are no fewer than six legislative proposals that are either on the table or soon to be on the table on this issue of banning human cloning. These bills range from a sweeping prohibition of all types of cloning to really some very symbolic bans. The National Bioethics Advisory Commission, the commission that was appointed by and that reports to President Clinton, did a good job of trying to assimilate the information on the cloning under their very short, 90-day deadline last year. But they, as hard as they tried, were unable to substantively address the ethical issues surrounding human cloning.

The commission cited at the time that they had inadequate time to tackle these difficult ethical issues in the context of our pluralistic society, and they focused primarily on scientific concerns, as well as the less abstract issue of safety—a really proscribed area of safety, saying that the technique today is not safe or has not been proven to be safe. And then they appealed, to us, as Americans—to take this to the public square, take this out to the people around America and talk to them and look for the sort of leadership that we need on forming a national policy on human cloning.

In an effort to follow up on the recommendations of the National Bioethics Commission, the Senate Labor Committee's Subcommittee on Public Health and Safety, which I chair, on June 17, 1997, held a hearing. That hearing was entitled ''Ethics and Theology: A Continuation of the National Discussion on Human Cloning.'' And we heard outstanding testimony on all sides of the issue, from Christian, Islamic and Jewish traditions and from philosophers and theologians, all well schooled in biomedical ethics. We launched a much broader public debate with questions about the nature of human individuality, about family, about social structure. However, the time has now shown that both a Presidential commission and the U.S. Congress are really inadequate forums to fully address the diversity, the richness, the fabric of these bioethical issues and their importance as we look to the future.

I, therefore, today, through our legislation, propose creation of a new, permanent, independent national bioethics commission, representative of the public at large, with the combined participation of experts in law, ethics, theology, medicine, social science, philosophy, coupled with interested members of the public. It is my hope that this public commission, in an environment where it can capture the diversity of our society today, will forge a new path for our country in the field of bioethics, in considering new techniques and new innovation; that they will enable us to have an informed, ongoing, thoughtful, scientific debate in the public square, without fear or politics driving our decisions.

In this proposal the majority and minority leaders of Congress would appoint members of the panel, but no current Member of Congress or administration political appointee would participate during his or her term of office. Individuals would serve for 3 years. There would be 24 such members, six subcommittees looking at the various fields that I have mentioned. Each and every citizen should have an opportunity to participate in these ongoing bioethical debates.

I anticipate that some may question the role of theology in a public policy debate. Certainly the President's advisory commission found that their considerations were incomplete without examining the religious mores of our culture. Indeed, our Founding Fathers also recognized that public policy could not be formulated in a theological vacuum. While they forbade the establishment of a state religion, they simultaneously affirmed the rights of God-fearing people to make their voices heard in the public arena. Today, and throughout history, religion has been a primary source of the beliefs governing these decisions for men and women of all races, of all creeds.

While these four principles that I outlined earlier start as the basic foundation, we do need to reach out and receive the input of others as we embark upon consideration of this piece of legislation. With these four principles it is my hope that we can build a bipartisan coalition of support for a ban on human cloning.

I do call upon my colleagues in the scientific community to step forward and participate in the ongoing debate in good faith. We have much to gain from your expertise, and the public has much to gain from your ongoing work.

In recent days, many in the biotechnology community have argued that the mass production of cloned human embryos for research purposes is vital to their research efforts. I appeal to them this afternoon to take one step back and recognize that this legislation does not prohibit the vast majority of all current embryo and stem cell research, and acknowledge that there are serious ethical dilemmas associated with churning out human embryos as if they were products on an assembly line.

Let us have no more hedging about what is and what is not an embryo. Biologically it is clear. Proponents of embryo research have always been quite open that they are seeking to do embryo research because the embryo is biologically unique. So I say to those in the research community, this legislation does not threaten your ongoing embryo research. It does not limit your ability to experiment with stem cells, with gene therapy, with in vitro fertilization. Help us stop Dr. Seed dead in his tracks. Keep this issue focused on human cloning and join our efforts to create a new commission to deal with these issues on an ongoing basis.

The Washington Post, in 1994 said:

> The creation of human embryos specifically for research that will destroy them is unconscionable. . .. Viewed from one angle this issue can be made to yield endless complexities. What about the suffering of individuals and infertile couples who might be helped by embryo research? What about the status of the brand new embryo? But before you get to these questions [the Post says] there is a simpler one.

It is the question I read a few minutes ago at the beginning of my statement and I will read it again. It is:

> Is there a line that should not be crossed, even for scientific or other gain, and if so, where is it?

As the editor of the New England Journal of Medicine has said in the past:

> Knowledge, although important, may be less important to a decent society than the way it is obtained.

This is where the debate will be over the next several days. I believe that an

honest ban on human cloning must begin at the level of the activation of the embryo, not later at some point, at the time of implantation. Is the Federal Government capable of preventing a woman from implanting an embryo derived from her own genetic makeup into her own womb? Is it wise to perfect our cloning techniques on embryos when we forbid their implantation? Yes, I think we need to start the ban at the time of the activation of the embryo.

In closing, it is clearly vital that our public debate and reflection on scientific developments keep pace with and even anticipate and prepare us for this, really, rush of new scientific knowledge that is coming toward us each and every day. The moral and ethical dilemmas that are inherent in the cloning of human beings may well be our greatest test to date. We don't simply seek knowledge, but we seek the wisdom to apply that knowledge. As with each of those mind-boggling advances of the last century, we know that there is the potential both for good and evil. Our task as legislators is to reflect the public trust, to define the role of the Federal Government in harnessing this technology for the good. Our task as citizens is to exercise responsible stewardship of the precious gift of life.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

By Mrs. BOXER:

S. 1600. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to waive in the case of multiemployer plans the section 415 limit on benefits to the participant's average compensation for his high 3 years; to the Committee on Finance.

INTERNAL REVENUE CODE LEGISLATION

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, section 415 of the Internal Revenue Code limits annual pension benefits from multiemployer plans to the average of the three highest consecutive years of income while a worker was covered by the plan. The bill I am introducing today will exempt multiemployer pension plans from the income-based limitations imposed by Section 415.

Section 415 was enacted in an effort to prevent the ''gaming'' which occasionally occurred in single employer pension plans. Such gaming occurred when an employee's salary was significantly increased the year before retirement in order to increase that employee's retirement benefits. Single employer plans, unlike multiemployer plans, are generally based upon an employee's salary prior to retirement. Reportedly, from time-to-time, such gaming did occur in single employer plans.

Multiemployer plans, conversely, are generally based on the number of years an employee has worked, plus the collectively-bargained-for dollar amount of contributions made into the plan. Therefore, such gaming generally did not occur in multiemployer plans. Section, 415, however, does not distinguish between multiemployer plans and single employer plans. Instead, section 415 assumes the salaries of all workers increase steadily over the course of their employment. In fact however, for many workers, particularly those that belong to multiemployer pension plans, there is no such steady increase in earnings. Rather, the salaries of these workers tend to fluctuate over the course of their employment. Because of these fluctuations, the three highest years of compensation for many multiemployer plan participants are not necessarily consecutive.

Congress recognized this inequity and in 1996, as part of the Small Business and Jobs Protection Act (Pub. L. 104–188), exempted public employee pension plans from Section 415. This exemption, however, was not extended to private sector employees covered by multiemployer pension plans. The bill I have introduced today exempts multiemployer pension plans, single employer plans would still be subject to Section 415 limitations.

Congressman PETER J. VISCLOSKY introduced similar legislation in April 1997 in the House of Representatives. His bill has bipartisan support in the House. I hope that my bill will receive similar support here in the Senate. Private sector employees, who are covered by multiemployer pension plans, should receive the same treatment as public sector employees. My bill will alleviate the disparity which now exists.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1600

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

SECTION 1. TREATMENT OF MULTIEMPLOYER PLANS UNDER SECTION 415 LIMIT ON BENEFITS.

Paragraph (11) of section 415(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to special limitation rule for governmental plans) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by inserting ''AND MULTIEMPLOYER PLANS'' after ''GOVERNMENTAL PLANS''; and

(2) by inserting ''or a multiemployer plan (as defined in section 414(f))'' after ''governmental plan (as defined in section 414(d))''.

SEC. 2. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by section 1 shall apply to plan years beginning after December 31, 1997.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 1602. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit any attempt to clone a human being using somatic cell nuclear transfer and to prohibit the use of Federal funds for such purposes, to provide for further review of the ethical and scientific issues associated with the use of somatic cell nuclear transfer in human beings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

THE PROHIBITION ON CLONING OF HUMAN BEING ACT OF 1998

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, today, Senator KENNEDY and I are introducing legislation that would prohibit, for a period of ten years, any person from attempting to clone a human being using somatic cell nuclear transfer technology.

The reason for this legislation is simple: the cloning of a human being today remains scientifically dangerous, morally unacceptable, and ethically flawed.

Let me be clear about the intent of this legislation right at the outset: I am opposed to human cloning. I do not believe it is, or will ever be, morally acceptable to clone human beings.

This legislation was carefully drafted so that it would not prevent or interfere with vital biomedical research into cancer and other diseases, birth defects, infertility, and the mass production of drugs and vaccines.

The Bill authorizes the continuation of the National Bioethics Advisory Commission, and requires the Commission to report to the President and the Congress in 4½ years and 9½ years on the science and ethical issues associated with this technology.

The Commission's reports to Congress will also include a recommendation as to whether the moratorium should be continued beyond the ten years set by this legislation.

TECHNOLOGY OUTPACES PUBLIC POLICY

The successful cloning of a sheep in Scotland last year, using a procedure known as somatic cell nuclear transfer, was hailed as an amazing scientific success.

But it also ignited a fierce international debate about the potential use of this technique to clone human beings, and the ethical, legal and religious questions raised by such a possibility.

Chicago-area physicist Dr. Richard Seed stirred that debate into full force last month when he told the media that he intends to clone human beings.

He said that there were ten clinics in the United States interested in offering cloning services and that he believes the demand will be for over 200,000 cases per year, according to the American Medical News.

Setting aside the fact that Dr. Seed's claims are somewhat implausible at the moment given the rudimentary state of cloning technology, he did hit a nerve.

This is a classic example, in my view, of how the lightening speed with which we are able to develop new technologies can sometimes get ahead of society's ability to handle these advances.

I do not believe that, today, we know enough to permit human cloning, or to make a permanent determination about the use of this technology.

But, when writing laws that would have such an enormous impact on an entire field of science—science that includes the development of lifesaving

new therapies for disease, the prevention of birth defects, and fertility—Congress has a responsibility to be prudent and judicious in drafting legislation.

In preparing this legislation, Senator KENNEDY and I, and our staffs, met with representatives from: The National Bioethics Advisory Commission; The National Institutes of Health; The American Society for Reproductive Medicine; The Biotech Industry Association; The Department of Health and Human Services; The Food and Drug Administration.

Included in the National Bioethics Advisory Commission were members of the religious and medical ethics communities.

This bill is carefully drafted to prohibit attempts to clone a human being, while not impeding other important research involving somatic cell nuclear transfer technology, and the cloning of cells, tissues, DNA and animals.

PROCEDURE IS UNSAFE

One compelling reason to prohibit attempts to clone human beings at this time is the fact that the technology is so new that it is unsafe even in animals.

Dolly, the famous cloned sheep, was the only success out of 277 attempts, and the procedure has not been repeated successfully (although there are reports of the pending birth of at least one calf using the same cloning procedure).

The National Bioethics Advisory Commission concluded that attempting to use this process to clone humans would involve unacceptable risks to the fetus or potential children, possibly resulting in multiple miscarriages, developmental abnormalities, and unknown risks to the mother.

Even if and when concerns about safety are resolved, the ethical concerns of cloning humans still remain.

This 10-year moratorium will allow us the time to study and debate this issue fully—which we as a society need to do because the science is not going to go away, and we will have to have a greater understanding of it to make informed decisions on its use.

MUST NOT IMPEDE OTHER IMPORTANT RESEARCH

The term ''cloning'' is used by scientists to describe various techniques that involve duplication of biological material, both animal and human.

A blanket ban on cloning, or on use of the nuclear cell transplant technique to clone, would be too broad, and would deprive the United States—and the world—of invaluable biological research.

The cloning technique that was used to produce Dolly, somatic cell nuclear transfer, was an extension of experiments carried out over 40 years to facilitate understanding of how development of an animal from a single fertilized egg is carried out.

The agricultural industry has been using nuclear transplantation research to try to improve livestock breeding.

Biotechnology companies are exploring ways to use cloning to improve the production of therapeutic drugs.

And health researchers are hoping that a greater understanding of nuclear transplantation cloning can lead to new treatment for human disease.

CANCER

A report issued by the National Institutes of Health, dated January 29, indicates that cloned tissue culture cells have allowed scientists to test potential chemotherapies on cancerous cells, to study the cellular events leading to cancer, and to mass-produce drugs and vaccines.

DIABETES

Cloning technology, using somatic cell nuclear transfer, could teach scientists how to augment the insulin-producing cells in diabetics using cells from their own bodies.

Not only could cloning technology revolutionize the treatment for diabetes—it could potentially provide a cure for this debilitating disease.

SKIN GRAFTS

Somatic cell nuclear transfer might also be used in the future to create skin grafts for people who are severely burned.

In severe burn cases, many times there is not enough healthy skin on the victim to perform a skin graft, so doctors are forced to use skin from cadavers or skin cells grown in tissue culture.

In both cases, the skin is genetically different from the burn victim, and while it provides material for emergency grafting, this skin is ultimately rejected and the patient must undergo numerous grafting.

Somatic cell nuclear transfer cloning could allow skin to be generated from virtually any of the burn victim's cells, which would be genetically identical and therefore should not be rejected.

The life-saving possibilities for this technology are enormous:

The creation of nerve stem cells to treat neurodegenerative diseases such as multiple sclerosis, Lou Gehrig's disease, Alzheimer's disease, Parkinson's disease, and to help repair injuries of the spinal cord.

Bone marrow stem cells, for the treatment of leukemia, sickle cell or other blood diseases.

Liver cells to treat liver damage.

Muscle cells to treat muscular dystrophy and heart disease.

Cartilage-forming cells to reconstruct joints damaged by injury or arthritis.

The cloning of cells in culture has reduced the use of live animals in research and has allowed studies of human cells that could not be done otherwise.

As scientists from NIH clearly warn, without future research exploring this cloning technology, these and other potential life-saving possibilities will be unrealized.

NIH scientists also make clear that all of these possibilities can be accomplished without using this technology to create, or attempt to create, a human being.

A letter signed by more than 50 medical and patient organizations sent to Members of Congress last week warning very clearly of the danger in drafting legislation to ban cloning.

In the letter they say:

> Poorly crafted legislation to ban the cloning of human beings may put at risk biomedical research, such as the use of cloning techniques on human cells, genes and tissues, which is vital to finding the cures to the diseases and ailments which our organizations champion.

THE DIFFERENCES WITH THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSAL

The bill we are introducing today is very similar to the President's bill which he sent to Congress on June 10, 1997. But it differs from the President's in five important aspects.

First, it adds additional provisions to prevent anyone from cloning or even attempting to clone a human being. In addition to the outright prohibition on cloning a human being, the bill prohibits the use of Federal funds for such a purpose. Furthermore, the bill prohibits shipping the product of somatic cell nuclear transfer in interstate or foreign commerce for the purpose of attempting to clone a human being. This provision will ensure that no one may attempt to evade the law by shipping the product of somatic nuclear cell transfer overseas for the purpose of cloning a human being.

Second, it stiffens already tough penalties in the President's bill to deter any attempt at cloning a human being. The bill provides a penalty of $1,000,000 or three times the gross gain or loss from such a violation, whichever is greater. In addition, the bill provides that any property used in an attempt to violate the act, as well as any property traceable to such an attempted violation, will be forfeited. Furthermore, the Attorney General, who is solely empowered to enforce the act, is granted the power of injunction to immediately enjoin violations.

Third, the bill preempts state laws that prohibit or restrict research regarding, or practices of, somatic cell nuclear transfer, mitochondrial or cytoplasmic therapy, or the cloning of molecules, DNA, cells, tissues, organs, plants, animals, or humans.

This provision is important because I believe we need a consistent national policy and we should discourage the practice of ''forum shopping'' from state to state for lenient laws.

This bill is not intended to preempt state laws such as California Penal Code Title 9, Chapter 12, Section 367g, and California Business and Professions Code Division 2, Chapter 5, Article 12, Section 2260, which require that physicians and other medical personnel obtain signed written consent from patients before sperm, ova, or embryos are used for any purpose other than reimplantation in the same patient or in their spouse, and require that any use

of sperm, ova, or embryos of donors comply with the written intent of the donor.

The California statues were passed in order to address serious allegations by at least 60 California families, that medical personnel at fertility clinics at the University of California at Irvine and the University of California at San Diego transferred donors' sperm, ova, or embryos to researchers or implanted them in other women, without donors' knowledge or consent. These allegations raise grave concerns about serious violations of personal integrity and privacy. This legislation is in no way intended to preempt or interfere in any way with these California statutes, or with related statutes that would have a similar effect.

Fourth, the bill we are introducing urges the President to cooperate with foreign countries to enforce restrictions on human cloning. Other countries are moving to ban human cloning and we should join them so that scientists cannot evade our laws by moving their operations offshore.

Finally, our bill establishes a 10-year ban, as opposed to the 5-year ban in the President's recommended legislation.

It is conceivable that there could be incredible scientific breakthroughs with cloning technology over the next 3 to 5 years.

But developing a legal and moral framework for understanding of the potential use and abuse of this technology will take much longer.

This legislation sunsets after 10 years, during which time the National Bioethics Advisory Commission must keep Congress and the President informed on the status of the science, its potential uses for society, and make recommendations on whether to continue the prohibition.

Congress can extend the ban temporarily or permanently at any time during or after the ten year period if it so chooses.

CONCLUSION

Creating life outside of the normal reproductive process has challenged many of our basic beliefs—never more so than with the notion of cloning a human being.

It is important that we as a society engage in a rigorous public debate to fully understand the science, the dangers, the potential benefits, and the moral and legal implications of this technology.

Throughout history, science has empowered humankind to achieve things never before believed possible. Our challenge is to harness this power without losing control over our own lives, or the moral compass that guides us.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit for the RECORD the letter to which I referred.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 2, 1998.

REGARDING: LEGISLATION TO BAN CLONING OF HUMAN BEINGS

DEAR MEMBER: We are writing to express our concern about legislation pending in the Congress to ban the cloning of entire human beings.

Let us be clear. We oppose the cloning of a human being. We see no ethical or medical justification for the cloning of a human being and agree with the conclusions of the National Bioethics Advisory Commission (NBAC) that it is unacceptable at this time for anyone in the public or private sector, whether in a research or clinical setting, to create a human child using somatic cell nuclear transfer technology. We recognize that this application of the technology raises fundamental ethical and social issues. This technology is not currently safe to use in humans.

The American Society for Reproductive Medicine, the Biotechnology Industry Organization, and the Federation of American Societies of Experimental Biology have all stated that their members will not seek to clone a human being. These three associations include essentially every researcher or practitioner in the United States who has the scientific capability to clone a human being.

We agree with NBAC in its report on cloning that: "It is notoriously difficult to draft legislation at any particular moment that can serve to both exploit and govern the rapid and unpredictable advances of science." Poorly crafted legislation to ban the cloning of human beings may put at risk biomedical research, such as the use of cloning techniques on human cells, genes and tissues, which is vital to finding the cures to the diseases and ailments which our organizations champion. Cancer, diabetes, allergies, asthma, HIV/AIDS, eye diseases, spinal cord injuries, Guillain-Barré syndrome, Gaucher disease, stroke, cystic fibrosis, kidney cancer, Alzheimer's disease, tuberous sclerosis, tourette syndrome, alcoholism, autoimmune diseases, osteoporosis, Parkinson's disease, infertility, heart disease, diseases of aging, ataxia telangiectasia and many other types of research will benefit from the advances achieved by biomedical researchers.

We urge the Congress to proceed with extreme caution and adhere to the ethical standard for physicians, "first do no harm." We believe that there are two distinct issues here, cloning of a human being and the healing which comes from biomedical research. Congress must be sure that any legislation which it considers does no harm to biomedical research which can heal those with deadly and debilitating diseases.

Please keep patients' concerns in mind as you proceed in analyzing this very complicated issue.

Sincerely,

AIDS Action Council; Allergy and Asthma Network/Mothers of Asthmatics, Inc.; Alliance for Aging Research; Alzheimer Aid Society; American Academy of Optometry; American Academy of Pediatrics; American Association for Cancer Education;

tion for Cancer Research; American Autoimmune Related Diseases Association; American College of Cardiology; American College of Medical Genetics; American Diabetes Association; American Heart Association; American Paralysis Association; American Pediatric Society.

American Society for Reproductive Medicine; American Uveitis Society; Americans for Medical Progress; Association of Medical School Pediatric Department Chairmen; Association of Pediatric Oncology Nurses; Asthma & Allergy Foundation of America; A–T Children's Project; Cancer Research Foundation of America; Cancer Care, Inc.; Cancervive; Candlelighter's Childhood Cancer Foundation; Cystic Fibrosis Foundation; Foundation for Biomedical Research; Guillain-Barré Syndrome Foundation International; International Patient Advocacy Association.

Joint Council of Allergy, Asthma and Immunology; Juvenile Diabetes Foundation International; Kent Waldrep National Paralysis Foundation; Log Cabin AIDS Policy Institute; National Alliance for Eye and Vision Research; National Alliance of Breast Cancer Organizations (NABCO); National Association for Biomedical Research; National Campaign to End Neurological Disorders; National Coalition for Cancer Research; National Foundation for Cancer Research; National Gaucher Foundation; National Kidney Cancer Association; National Osteoporosis Foundation; National Patient Advocate Foundation; National Stroke Association.

National Tuberous Sclerosis Association; Oncology Nurses Association; Outpatient Ophthalmic Surgery Society, Inc.; Parkinson's Action Network; Radiation Research Society; Research! America; Research Society on Alcoholism; RESOLVE; Roswell Park Cancer Institute; Society for Pediatric Research; Tourette Syndrome Association, Inc.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, several months ago, the world learned of one of the most astounding developments in modern biology: the cloning of a sheep named Dolly. This extraordinary scientific achievement awakened widespread concern about the possibility of a brave new world, where human beings would be cloned and where individuals would seek to achieve a kind of immortality by reproducing themselves. There is widespread agreement among scientists, ethicists, and ordinary Americans that production of human beings by cloning should be prohibited, at least until the possibilities and pitfalls of this scientific procedure are better understood.

The President reacted rapidly to this scientific advance and the unprecedented issues it raised by asking the National Bioethics Advisory Commission to study the issue and make recommendations. The Commission recommended that creation of human beings by cloning should be banned for several years, and the Administration has submitted legislation to implement this recommendation.

The legislation that Senator FEINSTEIN and I are introducing today will assure the American public that reproducing human beings by cloning will be prohibited. It largely follows the President's legislation and the Recommendations of the Commission. It makes it illegal to produce human beings by cloning and establishes strict penalties for those who try to do so. In addition, it prohibits anyone from beginning the cloning process in this

country and carrying out the implantation step in another country.

But just as important as what the bill does is what it does not do. It does not seek to use public concern about cloning to establish a back door ban on research into human development.

A prohibition that goes too far could outlaw needed research on the prevention, treatment, and cure of cancer.

It could outlaw needed research on fertility, to help birth defects, and hereditary diseases.

It could outlaw needed research on the cure of spinal cord injuries.

All of these various kinds of research have broad support in Congress and the country. Yet a blunderbuss ban on human development research could easily interfere with this important and life-saving research, or even halt it altogether.

In addition, the FDA has jurisdiction over human cloning and will act vigorously to shut down any clinic that operates without FDA approval. The FDA must find that human cloning is safe and effective. Given the current state of the science, the DFA would almost certainly decide that a human cloning procedure is not safe at the current time. The FDA approval process is not a permanent ban on human cloning, but it effectively bans the procedures for the near future.

The American Medical Association and over forty national medical organizations and research groups have voiced support for the kind of research that is urgently needed to continue the progress we are making against a wide range of diseases. Benjamin Younger, the Executive Director of the American Society for Reproductive Medicine, has said, ''We must work together to ensure that in our effort to make human cloning illegal we do not sentence millions of people to needless suffering because research and progress into their illness cannot proceed.''

The legislation we are introducing today will do what the American people want—ban the production of human beings by cloning. It strikes the proper balance between assuring that human beings will not be reproduced through cloning and allowing needed research to continue. I hope that Congress will act promptly to enact this legislation.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 89

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 89, a bill to prohibit discrimination against individuals and their family members on the basis of genetic information, or a request for genetic services.

S. 153

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 153, a bill to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 to allow institutions of higher education to offer faculty members who are serving under an arrangement providing for unlimited tenure, benefits on voluntary retirement that are reduced or eliminated on the basis of age, and for other purposes.

S. 260

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 260, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act with respect to penalties for crimes involving cocaine, and for other purposes.

S. 367

At the request of Mr. WELLSTONE, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 367, a bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 to allow leave to address domestic violence and its effects, and for other purposes.

S. 729

At the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 729, a bill to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to provide new portability, participation, solvency, and other health insurance protections and freedoms for workers in a mobile workforce, to increase the purchasing power of employees and employers by removing barriers to the voluntary formation of association health plans, to increase health plan competition providing more affordable choice of coverage, to expand access to health insurance coverage for employees of small employers through open markets, and for other purposes.

S. 1252

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. WELLSTONE) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1252, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the amount of low-income housing credits which may be allocated in each State, and to index such amount for inflation.

S. 1260

At the request of Mr. GRAMM, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1260, a bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to limit the conduct of securities class actions under State law, and for other purposes.

S. 1264

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1264, a bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act and the Poultry Products Inspection Act to provide for improved public health and food safety through enhanced enforcement.

S. 1291

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1291, a bill to permit the interstate distribution of State-inspected meat under certain circumstances.

S. 1297

At the request of Mr. COVERDELL, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL), the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON), and the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1297, a bill to redesignate Washington National Airport as ''Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport''.

S. 1334

At the request of Mr. BOND, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1334, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to establish a demonstration project to evaluate the feasibility of using the Federal Employees Health Benefits program to ensure the availability of adequate health care for Medicare-eligible beneficiaries under the military health care system.

S. 1335

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. COVERDELL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1335, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to ensure that coverage of bone mass measurements is provided under the health benefits program for Federal employees.

S. 1360

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1360, a bill to amend the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 to clarify and improve the requirements for the development of an automated entry-exit control system, to enhance land border control and enforcement, and for other purposes.

S. 1422

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1422, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to promote competition in the market for delivery of multichannel video programming and for other purposes.

S. 1563

At the request of Mr. SMITH, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1563, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to establish a 24-month pilot program permitting certain aliens to be admitted into the United States to provide temporary or seasonal agricultural services pursuant to a labor condition attestation.

SENATE RESOLUTION 96

At the request of Mr. CRAIG, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR), and the