

I think we can all learn by the example set almost 20 years ago when this body, as I mentioned earlier, confirmed C. Everett Koop to be Surgeon General over the objections of many in the other party.

The fears about Dr. Koop's partisanship were unfounded. Today, he is widely respected by Senators on both sides of the aisle, and it is my hope that this is a legacy Dr. Satcher will leave as well.

THE TOBACCO SETTLEMENT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I also want to take this opportunity to announce what I consider to be an important development on the tobacco legislative front.

This morning, a senior official in the administration, David Ogden, counselor to Attorney General Reno, delivered testimony on the tobacco settlement at the House Judiciary Committee hearing.

Mr. Ogden testified that:

If there is agreement on a comprehensive bill that advances the public health, then reasonable provisions modifying the civil liability of the tobacco industry would not be a deal breaker.

Since announcement of the June 20 proposed tobacco settlement last year, I have maintained that a legislative measure which incorporates strong public health provisions in conjunction with certain defined civil liability reforms could do more to stop the next generation of our children from getting hooked on tobacco than any bill we have ever considered.

The Administration's announcement today will do much to make passage of that landmark legislation possible. I call upon the President to send us his language on a priority basis. In fact, I have invited the Department of Justice to testify at the Judiciary Committee hearing next Tuesday on the tobacco settlement, and we will be greatly interested in the details of the President's position on liability.

Mr. President, this is a stunning breakthrough, one which I believe greatly increases the probability that a broad, bipartisan consensus can be reached on the tobacco settlement.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Finally, Mr. President, let me just conclude by asking unanimous consent that Bruce Artim and Marlon Priest be granted privileges of the floor during the pendency of the Satcher nomination and during consideration of S. 1601, the anti-cloning bill.

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

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. FRIST addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. FRIST. Would the Senator like me to yield?

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Tennessee be willing to yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. FRIST. Absolutely.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

(The remarks of Mr. LEAHY pertaining to the introduction of S. 1612 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. LEAHY. I thank my good friend from Tennessee for yielding me this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLARD). The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, Thank you.

COMMISSION TO PROMOTE A NATIONAL DIALOGUE ON BIOETHICS

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I want to take a moment to speak to the bioethics commission which will be proposed. It is part of a bill which I am not sure is going to make it to the floor today. I would like to comment on that commission.

Mr. President, I want to comment briefly on this concept which is in the bill that will be considered sometime in the future. I am not sure it will be this afternoon, or next week, or sometime in the future. And the aspect that I want to comment on is this bioethics commission. I think it is critical that at the end of this century and on into the next century we have somewhere in the United States a forum where we can carry on intelligent discussions on the ethical, the theological, the scientific, and the medical issues that are inevitable as science progresses with breakthrough discoveries that have the potential both for very good—very good—but also evil. Where do we digest those in the society when they are coming through not every week nor every month but even more frequently? In response to that, I proposed the national bioethics commission.

We have the National Bioethics Advisory Commission, so-called NBAC. And I think over the next few days the country will become familiar with that NBAC designation. The NBAC, the National Bioethics Advisory Commission was appointed entirely by the President of the United States. They did a very good job this past year in assimilating data, information, reports, and testimony from experts and the lay public broadly over a 90-day period addressing human cloning. That was a good start. But they very openly said that they were unable to substantively address the ethical issues surrounding human cloning.

As I have said earlier today, as a scientist, and a public servant now, I want to make the case that we can no longer separate science from the ethical consideration in that we as a body must address how to establish a forum in which such discussions can be carried out.

The Commission cited inadequate time to tackle the ethical issues in the context of our pluralistic, complex, intricate society in that they chose pri-

marily to focus on scientific concerns as well as the less abstract concept of safety. What is safe or not safe? Is this procedure safe, or is it not safe? They then appealed to each American citizen to step up to the plate and exercise their leadership and their moral leadership in formulating a national policy on human cloning. We need that forum.

Time has shown that neither the Presidential Commission nor the United States Congress is probably the forum, or at least is an inadequate forum, for addressing these bioethical issues which are of tremendous intricacy and important to society.

I, therefore, proposed this national bioethics commission in our legislation. It is representative of the public at large. It has the combined participation of experts in law, experts in science, experts in theology, experts in medicine, experts in social science, experts in philosophy, and the interest of members of the public. It is my hope that this commission will forge a new path for our country in the field of bioethics that will enable us to have an informed, a thoughtful, a sophisticated, and scientific debate in the public square without fear on behalf of the public, or politicians, or politics driving our decisions.

In this proposal, the majority and minority leaders of Congress would appoint the members of the panel. No current Member of Congress or the administration would serve on this panel. We simply must depoliticize these discussions which will simultaneously broaden input from the general public. Each and every citizen of this country should have the opportunity to contribute to these debates.

This commission would be established within the Institute of Medicine, and would be known as a commission to promote a national dialogue on bioethics.

Very briefly, it would have 25 members, 6 appointed by the majority leader of the Senate, 6 by the minority leader of the Senate, 6 appointed by the Speaker of the House, and 6 appointed by the minority leader of the House of Representatives. There would be a chairman. In addition, representatives stated in the legislation would be from the fields of law, theology, philosophy, ethics, medicine, science, and social science. The commission would be appointed no later than December 1st of this year. We have to move ahead quickly. They would serve for a length of 3 years. And the duties of the commission, as spelled out in the legislation, would be to 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.

Subcommittees are established on that commission for legal issues, for theological issues, for philosophical