HEINONLINE

Citation: 4 Bernard D. Reams Jr. Law of E-SIGN A Legislative of the Electronic Signatures in Global and National Act Public Law No. 106-229 2000 S10378 2002

Content downloaded/printed from HeinOnline (http://heinonline.org) Sun Apr 21 21:51:47 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.

nearly 20% of the server software market and growing.

The Connecticut lawsuit couldn't show any harm to consumers or competition. The record supported Microsoft's position—that its efforts to provide Windows NT has increased choice, increased features and dramatically reduced prices for customers seeking to use high-end PCs and servers.

Fortunately for all of us, the jury in the Bristol case recognized that antitrust laws are designed to protect competition, not competitors.

It is unfortunate that the Department of Justice, joined by some state attorneys general, does not share that view. Indeed, another lesson from the Bristol case is that the selective and subjective use of out-of-context e-mail snippets, while perhaps good theater, does not prove an antitrust case.

Seen in this light, the Bristol jury's verdict ought to concern the government. Why? If the Bristol verdict illustrates anything, it's that eight everyday consumers can recognize the intense level of competition that exists in today's software industry and the obvious benefits of low prices and better products for consumers.

Given that reality, the government's long battle against America's most admired company is a waste of taxpayer money. It's a flawed proceeding for which consumers clearly have no use.

By issuing a verdict reaffirming the pro-competitive and pro-consumer nature of today's software industry, the Connecticut jury signaled its support of continued innovation and free-market competition.

Paul Rochstein is a professor of law at Georgetown University and a consultant to Microsoft who has studied antitrust law under a U.S. Government Fulbright grant.

CRANBERRY AMENDMENT TO AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I would like to clarify that during the passage of the Agriculture Appropriations bill last night, S. 1233, Senator GORDON SMITH's amendment on cranberry marketing was adopted without the proper co-sponsorship. Mr. SMITH's cranberry marketing amendment, begun by Senator WYDEN, was to be co-sponsored by Senator WYDEN and myself, as well as Senators FEINGOLD, KERRY, KENNEDY, and MURRAY.

Mr. WYDEN. I Thank Senator KOHL. I appreciate the clarification and all his hard work on this issue of importance to cranberry growers across the country. When we go to conference on this bill, I will continue to support this amendment.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise tonight to express my regret that I am unable to sign the conference repot on the Fiscal Year 2000 Department of Defense Authorization Act.

This was my first year as a member of the Armed Service Committee. I want to commend Chairman WARNER and Senator LEVIN for their leadership and commitment to our nation's defense. The committee provided ample opportunity for me to learn about the issues, participate in the discussion, and express my views. I believe that the process which created this bill was, overall, thoughtful and fair.

This bill has many excellent provisions. It provides for a significant increase in defense spending but allocates the funds wisely. In creases funds for research and development which we must invest in if we are to remain the world's finest fighting force. It adds additional funds to the service's operation and maintenance accounts which should ease the strain of keeping our bases and equipment in good condition. The bill also funds many of the Service Chief's unfunded requirements, items, that are not flashy but are vital to military readiness.

Certainly the most important parts of this bill are those that address the issue of recruitment and retention. This bill provides for a pay increase, restoration of retirement benefits, and special incentive pays. The bill also begins to address some of the problems identified in the military healthcare system. Our men and women in uniform work tirelessly every day to defend the principles of this country and they deserve the benefits that are included in this legislation.

I have grave concerns, however, over the sections of this bill which affect the Department of Energy. A reorganization of the agency which manages our nation's nuclear arsenal should not be undertaken quickly or haphazardly. Yet this conference report contains language which was not considered by any committee or debated on the floor of either the House or the Senate. The ramifications of these provisions are unclear. Regrettably, I am unable to support a report which contains such provisions until I have had the opportunity to study them further.

I hope that further analysis reveals that this reorganization is workable and that ultimately, I am able to vote in favor of this report. However, at this time, I am reserving my judgment and will not sign the conference report.

PET SAFETY AND PROTECTION ACT OF 1999

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I welcome this opportunity to express my strong support for the Pet Safety and Protection Act of 1999, which will protect pets from unscrupulous animal dealers seeking to sell them to labs for biomedical research.

Animals play a critical role in biomedical research, but we must do all we can to ensure that research involving animals is regulated responsibly. Animal dealers and research facilities must be certain that lost or stolen pets do not end up in a research laboratory.

This bill will guarantee that only legitimate dealers who can verify the origin of their animals will be authorized to sell to research facilities. The Pet Safety and Protection Act of 1999 reaffirms the nation's commitment to safe and responsible biomedical research, while maintaining high ethical standards in the treatment of animals.

ELECTRONIC COMMERCE EXTENSION ESTABLISHMENT ACT OF 1999

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, yesterday I was pleased to be joined by Senators ROCKEFELLER, SNOWE, and MIKULSKI in introducing the Electronic Commerce Extension Establishment Act of 1999. The purpose of the bill is simple—to ensure that small businesses in every corner of our nation fully participate in the electronic commerce revolution unfolding around us by helping them find and adopt the right e-commerce technology and techniques. It does this by authorizing an "electronic commerce extension" program at the National Institute of Standards and Technology modeled on NIST's existing, highly successful Manufacturing Extension Program.

Everywhere you look today, e-commerce is starting a revolution in American business. Precise e-commerce numbers are hard to come by, but by one estimate e-commerce sales in 1998 were $100 billion. If you add in the hardware, software, and services making those sales possible, the number rises to $300 billion. Another estimate has business to business e-commerce growing to $1.3 trillion by 2003. Whatever the exact numbers, an amazing change in our economy has begun.

But the shift to e-commerce is about more than new ways to sell things; it's about new ways to do things. It promises to transform how we do business and thereby boost productivity, the root of long term improvements in our standard of living. A recent Washington Post piece on Cisco Systems, a major supplier of Internet hardware, notes that Cisco saved $500 million last year by selling its products and buying its supplies online. Imagine the productivity and economic growth spurred when more firms get efficiencies like that. And that's the point of the bill, to make sure that small businesses get those benefits too.

Electronic commerce is a new use of information technology and the Ineternet. Many people suspect information technology is the major driver behind the productivity and economic growth we've been enjoying. The crucial verb here is "use." It is the widespread use of a more productive technology that sustains accelerated productivity growth. It was steam engine, not its sales, that powered the industrial revolution.

Closer to today, in 1987, Nobel Prize winning economist Robert Solow quipped, "We see the computer age everywhere but in the productivity statistics." Well, it looks like the computer has started to show up because more people are using them in more ways, like e-commerce. Information technology producers, companies like Cisco Systems who are, notably, some

HeinOnline -- 4 Bernard D. Reams, Jr., Law of E-SIGN: A Legislative History of the Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act, Public Law No. 106-229 (2000) S10378 2002

of the most sophisticated users of IT, are 8% of our economy; from 1995 to 1998 they contributed 35% of our economic growth. There are also some indications that IT is now improving productivity among companies that only use IT.

But here is the real point. If we are going to sustain this productivity and economic growth, we have to spread sophisticated uses of information technology like e-commerce beyond the high tech sector and companies like Cisco Systems and into every corner of the economy, including small businesses. Back in the 1980's, we used to debate if it mattered if we made money selling "potato chips or computer chips." But here is the real difference: consuming a lot of potato chips isn't good for you; consuming a lot of computer chips is.

I emphasize this because too often our discussions of government policy, technology, and economic growth dwell on the invention and sale of new technologies, but shortchange the all important topic of their use. Extension programs, like the electronic commerce extension program in my bill, are policy aimed at precisely spreading the use of more productive technology by small businesses.

With that in mind, the e-commerce revolution creates both opportunities and challenges for small businesses. On the one hand, it will open new markets to them. On the web, the garage shop can look as good as IBM. On the other hand, the high fixed costs, low marginal costs, and technical sophistication that can sometimes characterize e-commerce, when coupled with a good brand name, may allow larger, more established e-commerce firms to quickly move from market to market. Amazon.com has done such a wonderful job of making a huge variety of books widely available that it's been able to expand to CDs, to toys, to electronics, to auctions. Moreover, firms in more rural areas have suddenly found sophisticated, low cost, previously distant businesses entering their market, and competing with them. Thus, there is considerable risk that many small businesses will be left behind in the shift to e-commerce. That would not be good for them, nor for the rest of us, because we all benefit when everyone is more productive and everyone competes.

The root of this problem is the fact that many small firms have a hard time identifying and adopting new technology. They are hard working, but they just don't have the time, people, or money to understand all the different technologies they might use. And, they often don't even know where to turn to for help. Thus, while small firms are very flexible, they can be slow to adopt new technology, because they don't know which to use or what to do about it. That is why we have extension programs. Extension programs give small businesses low cost, impartial advice on what technologies are out there and how to use them.

What might an e-commerce extension program do? Imagine you're a small speciality foods retailer in rural New Mexico and you see e-commerce as a way to reach more customers. But your specialty is chiles, not computers; imagine all the questions you would have. How do I sell over the web? Can I buy supplies that way too? How do I keep hackers out of my system? What privacy policies should I follow? How do I use encryption to collect credit card numbers and guarantee customers that I'm who I am? Can I electronically integrate my sales orders with instructions to shippers like Federal Express? Should I band together with other local producers to form a chile cybermall? What servers, software, and telecommunications will I need and how much will it cost? Your local e-commerce extension center would answer those questions for you. And, you could trust their advice, because you would know they were impartial and had no interest in selling you a particular product.

This bill will lead to the creation of a high quality, nationwide network of non-profit organizations providing that kind of advice, analogous to the Manufacturing Extension Program, or MEP, network NIST runs today, but with a focus on e-commerce and on firms beyond manufacturers. MEP demonstrates that NIST could do this new job well.

Similarly, this bill is modeled on the MEP authorization. It retains the key features of MEP: a network of centers run by non-profits; strict merit selection; cost sharing; and periodic independent review of each center. In addition, it emphasizes serving small businesses in rural or more isolated areas, so that those businesses can get a leg up on e-commerce too. In short, this legislation takes an approach that has already been proven to work.

Practically speaking, if this bill becomes law, I assume NIST would begin by leveraging their MEP management expertise to start a few e-commerce extension centers and then gradually build out a network separate from MEP. I also want to note that this is a new, separate authorization for an e-commerce extension program because it will have a different focus than MEP and because I do not want it to displace MEP in any way.

Mr. President, I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this important, timely, and practical piece of legislation. Just as a strong agricultural sector called for an agricultural extension service, and a strong industrial sector called for manufacturing extension, our shift to an information economy calls for electronic commerce extension.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Wednesday, August 4, 1999, the Federal debt stood at $5,615,253,056,263.06 (Five trillion, six hundred fifteen billion, two hundred fifty-three million, fifty-six thousand, two hundred sixty-three dollars and six cents).

One year ago, August 4, 1998, the Federal debt stood at $5,511,741,000,000 (Five trillion, five hundred eleven billion, seven hundred forty-one million).

Five years ago, August 4, 1994, the Federal debt stood at $4,643,455,000,000 (Four trillion, six hundred forty-three billion, four hundred fifty-five million).

Ten years ago, August 4, 1989, the Federal debt stood at $2,811,629,000,000 (Two trillion, eight hundred eleven billion, six hundred twenty-nine million) which reflects a doubling of the debt—an increase of almost $3 trillion—$2,803,624,056,263.06 (Two trillion, eight hundred three billion, six hundred twenty-four million, fifty-six thousand, two hundred sixty-three dollars and six cents) during the past 10 years.

ADVANCEMENT IN PEDIATRIC AUTISM RESEARCH ACT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I welcome the opportunity to join Senator GORTON and many other distinguished colleagues as a sponsor of the Advancement in Pediatric Autism Research Act. Autism is a heartbreaking disorder that strikes at the core of family relationships. We need to do all we can to understand the causes of autism in order to learn how to treat this tragic condition more effectively, and ultimately to prevent it. I want to commend Senator GORTON, the Cure Autism Now Foundation, and the many organizations and families in Massachusetts for their impressive leadership in dealing with this important cause of disability in children. In this age of such extraordinary progress on preventing, treating and curing so many other serious and debilitating illnesses, we cannot afford to miss this unique opportunity for progress against autism as well.

Clearly, we can do more to provide support for children and families who face the tragedy of autism. At the same time, I am concerned about certain provisions in the proposed legislation which could inadvertently cause harm to children with autism and to our system of funding research.

One provision allows use of NIH funds for health care and other services that "will facilitate the participation" in research. We must be clear that research dollars should be used only to cover costs that are required to carry out research. Insurance providers should never be able to use participation in research as an excuse to avoid paying for medically necessary health care. In addition, we must be especially careful to protect vulnerable children and families from situations in which financial incentives could affect decisions about participation in research.

I am confident that we can work together to address such issues as the bill moves through Congress. I look forward to working with my colleagues,

HeinOnline -- 4 Bernard D. Reams, Jr., Law of E-SIGN: A Legislative History of the Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act, Public Law No. 106-229 (2000) S10379 2002

HeinOnline -- 4 Bernard D. Reams, Jr., Law of E-SIGN: A Legislative History of the Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act, Public Law No. 106-229 (2000) S10380 2002

Document No. 90

HeinOnline -- 4 Bernard D. Reams, Jr., Law of E-SIGN: A Legislative History of the Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act, Public Law No. 106-229 (2000) [i] 2002