first comprehensive, Government-wide Performance Plan.

In developing this budget, the Administration for the first time could rely on performance measures and annual performance goals that are now included in agency Annual Performance Plans. We have made a good start on the process that the Administration and Congress outlined in enacting the 1993 law.

As we continue to implement this law, my Administration will focus more and more attention on how programs work, whether they are meeting their goals, and what we should do to make them better. We look forward to working with Congress on our shared goal of improving Government performance.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 2, 1998.*

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. ALLARD (for himself and Mr. BREAUX):

S. 1593. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act and the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act with respect to penalties for powder cocaine and crack cocaine offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 1594. A bill to amend the Bank Protection Act of 1968 for purposes of facilitating the use of electronic authentication techniques by financial institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. FRIST (for himself, Mr. BOND, Mr. GREGG, Mr. LOTT, Mrs. HUTCHISON, and Mr. LUGAR):

S. 1595. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission to Promote a National Dialogue on Bioethics.

By Mr. COVERDELL:

S. 1596. A bill to provide for reading excellence; 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. SPECTER:

S. Res. 171. A resolution designating March 25, 1998, as ''Greek Independence Day: A National Day of Celebration of Greek and American Democracy''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 1594. A bill to amend the Bank Protection Act of 1968 for purposes of facilitating the use of electronic authentication techniques by financial institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

THE DIGITAL SIGNATURE AND ELECTRONIC AUTHENTICATION LAW OF 1998

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Digital Signature and Electronic Authentication Law (SEAL) of 1998.

We Americans place such trust in the act of signing a document that we traditionally have referred to the written signature as a ''John Hancock'' after one of the first signers of the Declaration of Independence and one of our country's founding fathers. As the country moves into the 21st century and into the digital age, it is necessary for the government to validate the use of equally trustworthy forms of authentication for electronic transactions. In doing this, our country will secure its position as a leader in the international digital economy.

Electronic authentication, broadly defined, is any technology which provides a way for the recipient of a message to verify the identity of the sender, make sure the message was not altered in transit, and confirm that the message was the one the sender intended to transmit. Parties to electronic transactions must have access to this authentication process in order to feel secure in conducting business over open networks.

While this concept is fairly simple, the legislative process has proven quite complex. Many states have enacted legislation on electronic authentication, but the state laws are vastly different. Because electronic transactions do not respect state or national boundaries, there are no clear rules to govern this activity. This lack of direction has limited the use of electronic authentication. The process is further complicated by the number of competing technologies available to provide authentication as well as the fact that businesses from all different sectors of the economy seek to use and offer authentication services.

As Chairman of the Banking Committee's Subcommittee on Financial Services and Technology, I have examined this issue and have determined that the appropriate first step toward addressing it is to introduce a firmly grounded, free-market bill that addresses the concerns of financial institutions. In introducing this bill, I do not want to suggest that this authority should belong exclusively to that group. I have stated repeatedly my belief that all entities, banks and nonbanks alike, should be authorized to use electronic authentication for their own transactions and offer the service to third parties. In attempting to fashion a bill that would appropriately address the needs and concerns of all interested groups, however, I have reached an impasse. My attempts to reach out and engage those representing nonbank interests in serious discussions have failed. I have determined, therefore, that it is appropriate for me to take a first step and introduce this bill to address the needs of financial institutions.

While I do not intend to create a monopoly for banks, and indeed hope that this legislation can be amended to include other entities, I do recognize that there are valid reasons why we may choose to address the concerns of financial institutions separately.

Financial institutions are accustomed to assuming ''trusted third party'' roles, including serving as trustee and offering notary and signature guarantee services. Offering electronic authentication services is the functional equivalent of those traditional bank activities.

Financial institutions are highly regulated entities, and the financial institution regulators have experience in supervising these ''trusted third party'' activities.

Many of the transactions which individuals and businesses will seek to authenticate are likely to be financial transactions.

In Europe and other countries around the world, electronic authentication activities are conducted almost exclusively by financial institutions. By taking a first step and authorizing our financial institutions to use electronic authentication, we will strengthen our position in establishing the conditions for international transactions.

The Digital SEAL Bill is, as I have described it, a minimalist, free-market bill. It provides quite simply that a financial institution may use electronic authentication in the conduct of its business and that the use of such electronic authentication shall be valid. A financial institution's use of electronic authentication shall be governed by the rules of the system or agreement under which it operates and shall be regulated by the appropriate financial institution regulator. The bill defines electronic authentication broadly in an effort to be as technologically neutral as possible.

Of equal importance is what this bill does not do. It does not create a new regulatory bureaucracy to supervise this activity. It does not impair consumers' rights under the Truth in Lending Act, the Electronic Fund Transfer Act, or any state law of similar purpose. Finally, it does not limit, in any way, the ability of any other entity to use or offer electronic authentication in the course of its business.

The time has come for Congress to begin a serious discussion of the impact of technology on commercial transactions and consider how age-old concepts, like the importance of a signature, will fit into an increasingly electronic world. Electronic authentication is a good starting point for this discussion, and passage of this bill will advance the development of electronic banking and commerce.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to enact this legislation to give financial institutions, and appropriate other entities, the authority to use electronic authentication.

By Mr. FRIST (for himself, Mr. BOND, Mr. GREGG, Mr. LOTT, Mrs. HUTCHISON, and Mr. LUGAR):

S. 1595. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission to Promote a National Dialogue on Bioethics.

THE COMMISSION TO PROMOTE A NATIONAL DIALOGUE ON BIOETHICS ESTABLISHMENT ACT OF 1998

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, In recent years, I have often voiced concern that medical technology is moving at an unprecedented pace, leaving the rest of society ill-prepared to cope with the increasingly complex moral and ethical dilemmas that follow in the wake of new inventions. We must never attempt to divorce scientific progress from ethical considerations. We must instead 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?'' (Washington Post editorial, Oct. 2, 1994)

The recent furor over Dolly the cloned sheep, and Dr. Seed's subsequent announcement that he intended to clone a human being through the same technique, has highlighted the necessity of an independent, balanced forum to address the ethical implications of new technological capabilities. Two temptations threaten both science and ethics in the current milieu. There is pressure on legislators (often unfamiliar with scientific issues) to rush to draft laws that could hamper important research efforts. There is a parallel tendency on the part of academic scientists to resist any input from law or ethics into their research. Thus, science and ethics are lost in the political morass, while the public often remains uninvolved and frightened. The example of the cloning debate provides ample evidence of this tendency.

There are no fewer than six legislative proposals to address cloning on the horizon, ranging from sweeping prohibitions to largely symbolic bans. The National Bioethics Advisory Commission (a commission appointed entirely by President Clinton) did a good job of trying to assimilate the information on cloning under their ninety day deadline last year, but they were unable to substantively address the ethical issues surrounding human cloning. The Commission cited inadequate time to tackle difficult ethical issues in the context of our pluralistic society, and primarily focused on scientific concerns as well as the less abstract issue of safety. They then appealed to each American citizen to step to the plate and exercise moral leadership in forming a national policy on human cloning.

In an effort to follow up on the Commission's recommendations, the Senate labor Committee's Subcommittee on Public Health and Safety, which I chair, held a hearing June 17, 1997, entitled ''Ethics and Theology: A Continuation of the National Discussion on Human Cloning.'' We heard testimony on all sides of the issue, from the Christian, Islamic, and Jewish traditions, and from philosophers well-schooled in biomedical ethics. We launched a broader public debate with questions about the nature of human individuality, family, and social structure.

However, time has shown that both a Presidential Commission, and the United States Congress are inadequate and inappropriate forums for bioethical issues of intricacy and importance. I am therefore proposing to establish a new independent National Bioethics Commission, representative of the public at large, with combined participation of experts in law, science, theology, medicine, social science, and philosophy/ethics with interested 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 they will enable us to have an informed, thoughtful, scientific debate in the public square without fear or politics driving our decisions. The Majority and Minority Leaders of Congress would appoint members of the panel, but no current Member of Congress or Administration political appointee would be allowed to participate during their term of office. We simply must depoliticize these discussions while simultaneously broadening input from the general public. Each and every citizen should have the opportunity to contribute to these great 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. 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 and creeds.

So it is vital that our public debate and reflection on scientific developments keep pace, and even anticipate and prepare for new scientific knowledge. The moral and ethical dilemmas inherent in the cloning of human beings may well be our greatest test to date. We do not simply seek knowledge, but the wisdom to apply that knowledge. As with each of the mind boggling scientific advances of the last century, we know that there is the potential for both good and evil in this technology. Our task as legislators is to define the role of the federal government in harnessing this technology for good. Our task as citizens is to exercise responsible stewardship of the precious gift of life. May this Commission enable us to fulfill our trust.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 10

At the request of Mr. BURNS, his name was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 10, a bill to reduce violent juvenile crime, promote accountability by juvenile criminals, punish and deter violent gang crime, and for other purposes.

S. 260

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) 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. 261

At the request of Mr. DOMENICI, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 261, a bill to provide for a biennial budget process and a biennial appropriations process and to enhance oversight and the performance of the Federal Government.

S. 348

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 348, a bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to encourage States to enact a Law Enforcement Officers' Bill of Rights, to provide standards and protection for the conduct of internal police investigations, and for other purposes.

S. 412

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 412, A bill to provide for a national standard to prohibit the operation of motor vehicles by intoxicated individuals.

S. 497

At the request of Mr. COVERDELL, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 497, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act and the Railway Labor Act to repeal the provisions of the Acts that require employees to pay union dues or fees as a condition of employment.

S. 836

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 836, a bill to offer small businesses certain protections from litigation excesses.

S. 837

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 837, a bill to exempt qualified current and former law enforcement officers from State laws prohibiting the carrying of concealed firearms and to allow States to enter into compacts to recognize other States' concealed weapons permits.

S. 887

At the request of Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, the names of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. FORD) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. FAIRCLOTH) were added as cosponsors of S. 887, a bill to establish in the National Service the National Underground Railroad Network to Freedom program, and for other purposes.

S. 1069

At the request of Mr. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Delaware