HEINONLINE

Citation: 1 Federal Trademark Dilution Act of 1995 P.L. Stat. 985 January 16 1996 S19310 1996

Content downloaded/printed from HeinOnline (http://heinonline.org) Tue Mar 19 18:29:43 2013

-- Your use of this HeinOnline PDF indicates your acceptance of HeinOnline's Terms and Conditions of the license agreement available at http://heinonline.org/HOL/License

-- The search text of this PDF is generated from uncorrected OCR text.

way which ensures the most effective use of these resources.

It is time for us to direct this program where it has the best hope of making an impact and thus reduce the senseless accidents and tragic deaths at rail crossings.●

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1513. A bill to amend the Trademark Act of 1946 to make certain revisions relating to the protection of famous marks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE FEDERAL TRADEMARK DILUTION ACT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am very pleased to introduce today the Federal Trademark Dilution Act of 1995.

Mr. President, this bill is designed to protect famous trademarks from subsequent uses that blur the distinctiveness of the mark or tarnish or disparage it, even in the absence of a likelihood of confusion. Thus, for example, the use of DuPont shoes, Buick aspirin, and Kodak pianos would be actionable under this bill.

The concept of dilution dates as far back as 1927, when the Harvard Law Review published an article by Frank I. Schecter in which it was argued that coined or unique trademarks should be protected from the "gradual whittling away of dispersion of the identity and hold upon the public mind" of the mark by its use on noncompeting goods. Today, 25 States have laws that prohibit trademark dilution.

A Federal dilution statute is necessary, Mr. President, because famous marks ordinarily are used on a nationwide basis and dilution protection is only available on a patchwork system of protection. Further, some courts are reluctant to grant nationwide injunctions for violation of State law where half of the States have no dilution law. Protection for famous marks should not depend on whether the forum where suit is filed has a dilution statute. This simply encourages forum-shopping and increases the amount of litigation.

Moreover, Mr. President, the GATT agreement includes a provision designed to provide dilution protection to famous marks. Thus, enactment of this bill will be consistent with the terms of the agreement, as well as the Paris Convention, of which the United States is also a member. Passage of a Federal dilution statute, Mr. President, would also assist the executive branch in its bilateral and multilateral negotiations with other countries to secure greater protection for the famous marks owned by U.S. companies. Foreign countries are reluctant to change their laws to protect famous U.S. marks if the United States does not afford special protection for such marks.

Mr. President, as many Members will recall, a Federal dilution statute was proposed as part of the comprehensive trademark reform package that was enacted into law in November 1988, and took effect 1 year later. The comprehensive bill initially passed by the Senate included the dilution provision. However, the dilution proposal was deleted from the bill prior to final congressional passage. The current proposal, I believe, eliminates any concerns previously voiced in congressional hearings regarding the former Federal dilution provision.

Mr. President, the bill I am introducing today is the product of years of consideration and the study by Congress and various experts in this field, including the International Trademark Association, formerly the United States Trademark Association. It would amend section 43 of the Trademark Act to add a new subsection (c) to provide protection against another's commercial use of a famous mark which results in the dilution of such mark. The bill defines the term "dilution" to mean "the lessening of the capacity of registrant's mark to identify and distinguish goods and services regardless of the presence or absence of (a) competition between the parties, or (b) likelihood of confusion, mistake, or deception."

The proposal adequately addresses legitimate first amendment concerns espoused by the broadcasting industry and the media. The bill will not prohibit or threaten noncommercial expression, such as parody, satire, editorial and other forms of expression that are not a part of a commercial transaction. The bill includes specific language exempting from liability the "fair use" of a mark in the context of comparative commercial advertising or promotion.

The legislation sets forth a number of specific criteria in determining whether a mark has acquired the level of distinctiveness to be considered famous. These criteria include: First, the degree of inherent or acquired distinctiveness of the mark; second, the duration and extent of the use of the mark; and third, the geographical extent of the trading area in which the mark is used.

With respect to remedies, the bill limits the relief a court could award to an injunction unless the wrongdoer willfully intended to trade on the registrant's reputation or to cause dilution, in which case other remedies under the Trademark Act become available. The ownership of a valid Federal registration would act as a complete bar to a dilution action brought under State law.

Mr. President, the Judiciary Committee, which I chair, looks forward to working with all interested parties to secure enactment of a Federal dilution statute that adequately meets the needs of trademark owners and is consistent with the public interest.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and a section-by-section analysis be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1513

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 "Federal Trademark Dilution Act of 1995".

SEC. 2. REFERENCE TO THE TRADEMARK ACT OF 1946.

For purposes of this Act, the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes", approved July 5, 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1051 and following), shall be referred to as the "Trademark Act of 1946".

SEC. 3. REMEDIES FOR DILUTION OF FAMOUS MARKS.

(A) REMEDIES.—Section 43 of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1125) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(c)(1) The owner of a famous mark shall be entitled, subject to the principles of equity and upon such terms as the court deems reasonable, to an injunction against another person's commercial use in commerce of a mark or trade name, if such use begins after the mark becomes famous and causes dilution of the distinctive quality of the famous mark, and to obtain such other relief as is provided in this subsection. In determining whether a mark is distinctive and famous, a court may consider factors such as, but not limited to—

"(A) the degree of inherent or acquired distinctiveness of the mark;

"(B) the duration and extent of use of the mark in connection with the goods or services with which the mark is used;

"(C) the duration and extent of advertising and publicity of the mark;

"(D) the geographical extent of the trading area in which the mark is used;

"(E) the channels of trade for the goods or services with which the mark is used;

"(F) the degree of recognition of the mark in the trading areas and channels of trade of the mark's owner and the person against whom the injunction is sought;

"(G) the nature and extent of use of the same or similar marks by third parties; and

"(H) the existence of a registration under the Act of March 3, 1881, or the Act of February 20, 1905, or on the principal register.

"(2) In an action brought under this subsection, the owner of a famous mark shall be entitled only to injunctive relief unless the person against whom the injunction is sought willfully intended to trade on the owner's reputation or to cause dilution of the famous mark. If such willful intent is proven, the owner of a famous mark shall also be entitled to the remedies set forth in sections 35(a) and 36, subject to the discretion of the court and the principles of equity.

"(3) The ownership by a person of a valid registration under the Act of March 3, 1881, or the Act of February 20, 1905, or on the principal register shall be a complete bar to an action against that person, with respect to that mark, that is brought by another person under the common law or statute of a State and that seeks to prevent dilution of the distinctiveness of a mark, label, or form of advertisement.

"(4) The following shall not be actionable under this section:

"(A) Fair use of a famous mark by another person in comparative commercial advertising or promotion to identify the competing goods or services of the owner of the famous mark.

"(B) Noncommercial use of a mark.

"(C) All forms of news reporting and news commentary.".

HeinOnline -- 1 Federal Trademark Dilution Act of 1995: P.L. 104-98:109 Stat. 985: January 16, 1996 S19310 1996

and dilution protection is only available on a patch-quilt system of protection. Further, some courts are reluctant to grant nationwide injunctions for violation of State law where half of the States have no dilution law. Protection for famous marks should not depend on whether the forum where suit is filed has a dilution statute. This simply encourages forum-shopping and increases the amount of litigation.

H.R. 1295 would amend section 43 of the Trademark Act to add a new subsection (c) to provide protection against another's commercial use of a famous mark which result in dilution of such mark. The bill defines the term "dilution" to mean "the lessening of the capacity of registrant's mark to identify and distinguish goods or services of the presence or absence of (a) competition between the parties, or (b) likelihood of confusion, mistake, or deception."

The proposal adequately addresses legitimate first amendment concerns espoused by the broadcasting industry and the media. The bill would not prohibit or threaten noncommercial expression, such as parody, satire, editorial, and other forms of expression that are not a part of a commercial transaction. The bill includes specific language exempting from liability the "fair use" of a mark in the context of comparative commercial advertising or promotion and all forms of news reporting and news commentary.

The legislation sets forth a number of specific criteria in determining whether a mark has acquired the level of distinctiveness to be considered famous. These criteria include: First, the degree of inherent or acquired distinctiveness of the mark; second, the duration and extent of the use of the mark; and third, the geographical extent of the trading area in which the mark is used.

With respect to remedies, the bill limits the relief a court could award to an injunction unless the wrongdoer willfully intended to trade on the trademark owner's reputation or to cause dilution, in which case other remedies under the Trademark Act become available. The ownership of a valid Federal registration would act as a complete bar to a dilution action brought under State law.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1295 is strongly supported by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, the International Trademark Association; the American Bar Association; Time Warner; the Campbell Soup Co.; the Samsonite Corp., and many other U.S. companies, small businesses, and individuals. It is solid legislation and I urge its passage.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join the Intellectual Property Subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from California, in support of H.R. 1295, the Trademark Dilution Act. In particular, I am pleased that the bill before us today includes an amendment I offered in subcommittee to extend the Federal remedy against trademark dilution to unregistered as well as registered famous marks.

At our hearing on H.R. 1295, the administration made a compelling case that limiting the Federal remedy against trademark dilution to those famous marks that are registered is not within the spirit of the United States position as a leader setting the standards for strong worldwide protection of intellectual property. Such a limitation would undercut the United States' position with our trading partners, which is that famous marks should be protected regardless of whether the marks are registered in the country where protection is sought.

In all of our work this year, the Intellectual Property Subcommittee has been strongly committed to making sure that the United States is a leader in setting high standards worldwide for the protection of intellectual property. This bill is fully within that tradition, and will strengthen our hand in our negotiations with our trading partners.

It is also important to recognize, as the Patent and Trademark Office pointed out in its testimony, that existing precedent does not distinguish between registered and unregistered marks in determining whether a mark is entitled to protection as a famous mark. To the extent that dilution has been a remedy available to the owner of a trademark or service mark in the United States under State statutes and the common law, that remedy has not been limited only to registered marks. So it really doesn't make any sense, if we are going to create a Federal statute on trademark dilution, to limit the remedy to registered marks.

For these reasons, I am happy that the bill before us today includes a strong Federal remedy for trademark dilution, not only with respect to registered marks, but also with respect to unregistered famous marks. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers on this bill, so I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). The question is on the motion of the gentleman from California [Mr. MOORHEAD] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1295, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

ENHANCING FAIRNESS IN COMPENSATING OWNERS OF PATENTS USED BY THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 632) to enhance fairness in compensating owners of patents used by the United States, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 632

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

SECTION 1. JUST COMPENSATION.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Section 1498(a) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end of the first paragraph the following: "Reasonable and entire compensation shall include the owner's reasonable costs, including reasonable fees for expert witnesses and attorneys, in pursuing the action if the owner is an independent inventor, a nonprofit organization, or an entity that had no more than 500 employees at any time during the 5-year period preceding the use or manufacture of the patented invention by or for the United States. Reasonable and entire compensation described in the preceding sentence shall not be paid from amounts available under section 1304 of title 31, but shall be payable subject to such extent or in such amounts as are provided in annual appropriations Acts.".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to actions under section 1498(a) of title 28, United States Code, that are pending on, or brought on or after, January 1, 1995.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. MOORHEAD] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. MOORHEAD].

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 632, a bill to enhance fairness in compensating owners of patents used by the United States. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and yield myself as much time as I may consume. An amended version of this bill is presented for passage under suspension of the rules. The amendment to the reported bill reflects technical changes which conform to suggestions given after consideration of the bill by the Committee on the Budget.

I would like to thank the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Courts and Intellectual Property, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER], for her efforts in bringing this bill before the subcommittee and for her work on the important issue of

HeinOnline -- 1 Federal Trademark Dilution Act of 1995: P.L. 104-98:109 Stat. 985: January 16, 1996 H14318 1996

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The heading for title VIII of the Trademark Act of 1946 is amended by striking "AND FALSE DESCRIPTIONS" and inserting "FALSE DESCRIPTIONS, AND DILUTION".

SEC. 4. DEFINITION.

Section 45 of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1127) is amended by inserting after the paragraph defining when a mark shall be deemed to be "abandoned" the following:

"The term 'dilution' means the lessening of the capacity of a famous mark to identify and distinguish goods or services, regardless of the presence or absence of—

"(1) competition between the owner of the famous mark and other parties, or

"(2) likelihood of confusion, mistake, or deception.".

SEC. 5. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE FEDERAL TRADEMARK DILUTION ACT OF 1995

Section 1. Section one of the bill provides the short title of the bill, the "Federal Trademark Dilution Act of 1995."

Section 2. Section 2 of the bill clarifies the references in the bill to the "Trademark Act of 1946," giving the full title of the law and statutory citations.

Section 3. Section 3 of the bill would create a new Section 43© of the Lanham Act to provide a cause of action for dilution of "famous" marks. A new Section 43(c)(1) would provide protection to the owners of famous marks against another person's commercial use in commerce of the mark which dilutes the distinctive quality of the mark. The section would provide protection to famous marks, whether or not the mark is the subject of a federal trademark registration.

Section 3 identifies a list of nonexclusive factors that a court may consider in determining whether a mark qualifies for protection. These factors include: (1) the degree of distinctiveness of the mark; (2) the duration and extent of use of the mark; (3) the geographical extent of the trading area in which the mark is used; and (4) whether the mark is federally registered.

With respect to relief, a new Section 43(c)(2) of the Lanham Act would provide that, normally, the owner of a famous mark will only be entitled to an injunction upon a finding of liability. An award of damages, including the possibility of treble damages, may be awarded upon a finding that the defendant willfully intended to trade on the trademark owner's reputation or to cause dilution of the famous mark.

Under section 3 of the bill, a new Section 43(c)(3) of the Lanham Act would provide that ownership of a valid federal trademark registration is a complete bar to an action brought against the registrant under state dilution law. In this regard, it is important to note that the proposed federal dilution statute would not preempt state dilution laws.

A new Section 43(c)(4) sets forth various activities that would not be actionable. These activities include the use of a famous mark for purposes of comparative advertising, the noncommercial use of a famous mark, and the use of a famous mark in the context of news reporting and news commentary. This section is consistent with existing case law. The cases recognize that the use of marks in certain forms of artistic and expressive speech is protected by the First Amendment.

Section 4. Section 4 of the bill defines the term "dilution" to mean the lessening of the capacity of a famous mark to identify and distinguish goods or services, regardless of the presence or absence of (1) competition between the owner of the famous mark and other parties, or (2) likelihood of confusion, mistake, or deception. The definition is designed to encompass all forms of dilution recognized by the courts, including disparagement. In an effort to clarify the law on the subject, the definition also recognizes that a cause of action for dilution may exist whether or not the parties market the same or related goods and whether or not likelihood of confusion exists.

Section 5. Section 5 of the bill makes the legislation effective upon enactment.

SENATE RESOLUTION 206—MAKING MINORITY PARTY APPOINTMENTS

Mr. LEAHY (for Mr. DASCHLE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 206

Resolved, That the following shall constitute the minority party's membership on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for the second session of the 104th Congress, or until their successors are appointed: Mr. Rockefeller, Mr. Graham, Mr. Akaka, Mr. Wellstone, and Mrs. Murray.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TEXAS' STATEHOOD SESQUICENTENNIAL

• Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I am honored today to recognize a momentous occasion in the history of the great State which I have the privilege to represent, the proud Lone Star State of Texas. This month we recognize and celebrate Texas' statehood sesquicentennial, 150 years during which we have been blessed and have prospered.

The spirit of Texas has been evident since our earliest days, when we were conceived in the eternal struggle for freedom. The men and women of Texas have an innate and inherent commitment to God and country, and even our flag displays a single star— our people have always looked to the Heavens.

No utterance in our State's history better represents the spirit, virtue, and values of Texas, then or now, than the remarkable letter written on February 24, 1836, by William Barret Travis at the Alamo:

To the People of Texas and all Americans in the world—

Fellow citizens and compatriots—

I am besieged, by a thousand or more of the Mexicans under Santa Anna—I have sustained a continual Bombardment and cannonade for 24 hours and have not lost a man—The enemy has demanded a surrender at discretion; otherwise, the garrison are to be put to the sword, if the fort is taken—I have answered the demands with a cannon shot, and our flag still waves proudly from the wall—I shall never surrender or retreat. Then, I call on you in the name of Liberty, or patriotism and of everything dear to the American character, to come to our aid, with all dispatch—The enemy is receiving reinforcements daily and will no doubt increase to three or four thousand in four or five days. If this call is neglected, I am determined to sustain myself as long as possible and die like a soldier who never forgets what is due to his own honor and that of his country—Victory or Death.

WILLIAM BARRET TRAVIS,
Lieutenant Colonel Commandant.

Colonel Travis' letter captures the heart and soul of the people of Texas, and I am honored to recognize the statehood sesquicentennial of my beloved Texas.•

SIGNING DULY ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, today when the Senate convened, the President pro tempore, Senator THURMOND, appointed the Senator from Idaho, Senator KEMPTHORNE, to be Acting President pro tempore for the day. It is my understanding Senator THURMOND is necessarily absent attending business in South Carolina and attending the funeral of the president pro tempore of the South Carolina State Senate, the Honorable Marshall Williams.

While Senator KEMPTHORNE was Acting President pro tempore for today, one of his responsibilities was to sign duly enrolled bills. Signing enrolled bills is part of the process necessary prior to the documents being sent to the White House for the President's approval or disapproval.

Senator KEMPTHORNE had the distinct pleasure to sign the following enrolled bills, therefore facilitating their being sent to the White House: H.R. 4, welfare reform; H.R. 394, State pensions; H.R. 1878, enrollment of HMO's; and H.R. 2627, Smithsonian coin.

I want to commend Senator KEMPTHORNE and congratulate him on his work today. I hope the President signs all the bills. That may or may not be the case.

REAUTHORIZING THE TIED AID CREDIT PROGRAM

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 2203, just received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2203) to reauthorize the Tied Aid Credit Program of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and to allow the Export-Import Bank to conduct a demonstration project.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be deemed read a third time, passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be placed at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

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

So the bill (H.R. 2203) was deemed read the third time and passed.

HeinOnline -- 1 Federal Trademark Dilution Act of 1995: P.L. 104-98:109 Stat. 985: January 16, 1996 S19311 1996

FEDERAL TRADEMARK DILUTION ACT OF 1995

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 1295, just received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1295) to amend the Trademark Act of 1946 to make certain revisions relating to the protection of famous marks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, passage of this bill is part of our effort to improve intellectual property protection around the world. I hope that it will serve to improve trademark enforcement domestically and serve as a model for our trading partners overseas.

Along with the Anti-Counterfeiting and Consumer Protection Act of 1995, S. 1360, which recently passed the Senate and has already been the subject of a hearing and markup before the House Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Courts and Intellectual Property, this bill will help protect the good names, reputations for quality, and investments of American companies from IBM to Ben & Jerry's.

Although no one else has yet considered this application, it is my hope that this antidilution statute can help stem the use of deceptive Internet addresses taken by those who are choosing marks that are associated with the products and reputations of others.

I thank our House colleagues for their work on this bill. It is a pleasure to work with Chairman MOORHEAD and the House subcommittee on these matters. I commend, in particular, Representative SCHROEDER for her outstanding work on this measure. Our House colleagues have announced their intention not to seek reelection next fall. Their leadership and judgment will be greatly missed.

When we in the Senate last considered and passed a similar bill to provide an injunctive remedy against the dilution of the effectiveness of distinctive marks, we did so as part of more comprehensive trademark revision legislation in 1988. Since that time the dilution of well-known marks has become a greater problem both domestically and, especially, internationally.

We intend for this legislation to strengthen the hand of our international negotiators from the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative and the Department of Commerce as they press for bilateral and multilateral agreements to secure greater protection for the world famous marks of our U.S. companies. Foreign countries should no longer argue that we do not protect our marks from dilution, nor seek to excuse their own inaction against practices that are destructive of the distinctiveness of U.S. marks within their borders.

I am delighted that bill now includes express reference to fair use, news reporting, and news commentary. I continue to believe, as our House colleagues also affirm, that parody, satire, editorial, and other forms of expression will remain unaffected by this legislation.

Finally, I want to acknowledge the strong support of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, the Department of Commerce, and that of the International Trademark Association and its many members. Without their efforts, we would not be in position to approve this legislation and send it to the President for his signature.

Mr. President, this was an example of Senator HATCH, myself, and others working in a bipartisan effort to get a major piece of legislation through. I thank the leader for his efforts in getting it through.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be deemed read a third time, passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be placed at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

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

So the bill (H.R. 1295) was deemed read the third time and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate immediately proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination on today's Excutive Calendar: Calendar No. 439.

I further ask unanimous consent that the nomination be confirmed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, that any statements relating to the nomination appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD, that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and that the Senate then return to legislative session.

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

So the nomination was considered and confirmed, as follows:

Jed S. Rakoff, of New York, to be U.S. District Judge for the Southern District of New York.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now return to legislative session.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, let me indicate that we have had a meeting all afternoon at the White House, and I will say, without violating our agreement on statements, afterward we had a good working session. We covered a lot of ground. We are going to meet tomorrow morning. We are going to be there all day, and probably through the evening. We will determine then whether or not we will be here Sunday or Monday. I think it is fair to say that we had a constructive session where everybody, in my view—regardless of party, regardless of being from the White House, Democrats or Republicans, the House or the Senate—had one thing in mind: trying to move the process along to get a balanced budget over the next 7 years.

I think there is a recognition that most Americans, regardless of party, want us to do that. We are not there yet. We have a lot of work to do. But I would say that today has been a day of progress.

I would also say that it had been my hope earlier that we could work out an agreement where Federal employees could go back to work. A week ago today we passed a measure in the Senate by unanimous consent that, in effect, deemed all Federal employees "essential" and also guaranteed that they would be paid. That bill went to the House, but it has not been considered.

I was advised today by the majority leader in the House, Congressman ARMEY, and the speaker, Congressman GINGRICH, that if we would send to the House the same measure we passed last week, and the so-called Mideast Peace Facilitation Act, and a third provision with reference to expedited procedures, so that once an agreement is reached there will be some expedited procedure in the Senate so that we will be certain we get a disposition of it, that they would be able to take that up today, Friday, by unanimous consent in the House. That was their best judgment. And so I was in hopes that we could work that out on the Senate side.

I was advised at the White House by the distinguished Democratic leader, Senator DASCHLE, that they would have to object because of the expedited procedure language, which seems to me something we ought to be able to work out. If we want people to go back to work and we want to make certain they will be paid and we also want to pass another very important piece of legislation, we ought to be able to reach some agreement on how we are going to handle the bill if we have an agreement, or if we do not have an agreement, how would we handle the balanced budget amendment.

I will ask that the text of this be printed in the RECORD after I ask unanimous consent, which will be objected to. But we have just taken the Budget Act, reduced the time to 10 hours, open to amendment during that 10 hours. Otherwise, we kept the Byrd amendment, for example. So we hope that the Democratic leader will have an opportunity between now and tomorrow to maybe come back with a counteroffer, because we are ready to act, put people back to work, and my view is that it is a very important matter that should be attended to.

HeinOnline -- 1 Federal Trademark Dilution Act of 1995: P.L. 104-98:109 Stat. 985: January 16, 1996 S19312 1996