

of benefits under an electronic benefit transfer contract before the expiration of the term of the contract if the contract—

“(i) is entered into before the date that is 30 days after the regulations are promulgated under paragraph (4); and

“(ii) expires after October 1, 2002.

“(B) WAIVER.—At the request of a State agency, the Secretary may provide 1 waiver to temporarily exempt, for a period ending on or before the date specified under clause (iii), the State agency from complying with the requirements of paragraph (2), if the State agency—

“(i) establishes to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the State agency faces unusual technological barriers to achieving by October 1, 2002, the interoperability and portability required under paragraph (2);

“(ii) demonstrates that the best interest of the food stamp program would be served by granting the waiver with respect to the electronic benefit transfer system used by the State agency to administer the food stamp program; and

“(iii) specifies a date by which the State agency will achieve the interoperability and portability required under paragraph (2).

“(C) SMART CARD SYSTEMS.—The Secretary shall allow a State agency that is using smart cards for the delivery of food stamp program benefits to comply with the requirements of paragraph (2) at such time after October 1, 2002, as the Secretary determines that a practicable technological method is available for interoperability with electronic benefit transfer cards.

“(6) FUNDING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary, the Secretary shall pay 100 percent of the costs incurred by a State agency under this Act for switching and settling interstate transactions—

“(i) incurred after the date of enactment of this subsection and before October 1, 2002, if the State agency uses the standard of interoperability and portability adopted by a majority of State agencies; and

“(ii) incurred after September 30, 2002, if the State agency uses the uniform national standard of interoperability and portability adopted under paragraph (4)(A).

“(B) LIMITATION.—The total amount paid to State agencies for each fiscal year under subparagraph (A) shall not exceed \$500,000.”.

SEC. 4. STUDY OF ALTERNATIVES FOR HANDLING ELECTRONIC BENEFIT TRANSACTIONS INVOLVING FOOD STAMP BENEFITS.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall study and report to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate on alternatives for handling interstate electronic benefit transactions involving food stamp benefits provided under the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.), including the feasibility and desirability of a single hub for switching (as defined in section 7(k)(1) of that Act (as added by section 3)).

MILLENNIUM DIGITAL COMMERCE ACT

S. 761, passed during today's session, follows:

S. 761

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 “Millennium Digital Commerce Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The growth of electronic commerce and electronic government transactions represent a powerful force for economic growth, consumer choice, improved civic participation and wealth creation.

(2) The promotion of growth in private sector electronic commerce through Federal legislation is in the national interest because that market is globally important to the United States.

(3) A consistent legal foundation, across multiple jurisdictions, for electronic commerce will promote the growth of such transactions, and that such a foundation should be based upon a simple, technology neutral, nonregulatory, and market-based approach.

(4) The Nation and the world stand at the beginning of a large scale transition to an information society which will require innovative legal and policy approaches, and therefore, States can serve the national interest by continuing their proven role as laboratories of innovation for quickly evolving areas of public policy, provided that States also adopt a consistent, reasonable national baseline to eliminate obsolete barriers to electronic commerce such as undue paper and pen requirements, and further, that any such innovation should not unduly burden inter-jurisdictional commerce.

(5) To the extent State laws or regulations do not provide a consistent, reasonable national baseline or in fact create an undue burden to interstate commerce in the important burgeoning area of electronic commerce, the national interest is best served by Federal preemption to the extent necessary to provide such consistent, reasonable national baseline or eliminate said burden, but that absent such lack of consistent, reasonable national baseline or such undue burdens, the best legal system for electronic commerce will result from continuing experimentation by individual jurisdictions.

(6) With due regard to the fundamental need for a consistent national baseline, each jurisdiction that enacts such laws should have the right to determine the need for any exceptions to protect consumers and maintain consistency with existing related bodies of law within a particular jurisdiction.

(7) Industry has developed several electronic signature technologies for use in electronic transactions, and the public policies of the United States should serve to promote a dynamic marketplace within which these technologies can compete. Consistent with this Act, States should permit the use and development of any authentication technologies that are appropriate as practicable as between private parties and in use with State agencies.

SEC. 3. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to permit and encourage the continued expansion of electronic commerce through the operation of free market forces rather than prescriptive governmental mandates and regulations;

(2) to promote public confidence in the validity, integrity and reliability of electronic commerce and online government under Federal law;

(3) to facilitate and promote electronic commerce by clarifying the legal status of electronic records and electronic signatures in the context of contract formation;

(4) to facilitate the ability of private parties engaged in interstate transactions to agree among themselves on the appropriate electronic signature technologies for their transactions; and

(5) to promote the development of a consistent national legal infrastructure necessary to support electronic commerce at the

Federal and State levels within existing areas of jurisdiction.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **ELECTRONIC.**—The term “electronic” means relating to technology having electrical, digital, magnetic, wireless, optical, electromagnetic, or similar capabilities.

(2) **ELECTRONIC AGENT.**—The term “electronic agent” means a computer program or an electronic or other automated means used to initiate an action or respond to electronic records or performances in whole or in part without review by an individual at the time of the action or response.

(3) **ELECTRONIC RECORD.**—The term “electronic record” means a record created, generated, sent, communicated, received, or stored by electronic means.

(4) **ELECTRONIC SIGNATURE.**—The term “electronic signature” means an electronic sound, symbol, or process attached to or logically associated with a record and executed or adopted by a person with the intent to sign the record.

(5) **GOVERNMENTAL AGENCY.**—The term “governmental agency” means an executive, legislative, or judicial agency, department, board, commission, authority, or institution of the Federal Government or of a State or of any county, municipality, or other political subdivision of a State.

(6) **RECORD.**—The term “record” means information that is inscribed on a tangible medium or that is stored in an electronic or other medium and is retrievable in perceivable form.

(7) **TRANSACTION.**—The term “transaction” means an action or set of actions relating to the conduct of commerce, between 2 or more persons, neither of which is the United States Government, a State, or an agency, department, board, commission, authority, or institution of the United States Government or of a State.

(8) **UNIFORM ELECTRONIC TRANSACTIONS ACT.**—The term “Uniform Electronic Transactions Act” means the Uniform Electronic Transactions Act as provided to State legislatures by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Law in that form or any substantially similar variation thereof.

SEC. 5. INTERSTATE CONTRACT CERTAINTY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In any commercial transaction affecting interstate commerce, a contract may not be denied legal effect or enforceability solely because an electronic signature or electronic record was used in its formation.

(b) **METHODS.**—Parties to a transaction are permitted to determine the appropriate electronic signature technologies for their transaction, and the means of implementing such technologies.

(c) **PRESENTATION OF CONTRACTS.**—Notwithstanding subsection (a), if a law requires that a contract be in writing, the legal effect or enforceability of an electronic record of such contract shall be denied under such law, unless it is delivered to all parties to such contract in a form that—

(1) can be retained by the parties for later reference; and

(2) can be used to prove the terms of the agreement.

(d) **SPECIFIC EXCLUSIONS.**—The provisions of this section shall not apply to a statute, regulation, or other rule of law governing any of the following:

(1) The Uniform Commercial Code, as in effect in a State, other than sections 1–107 and 1–206, Article 2, and Article 2A.

(2) Premarital agreements, marriage, adoption, divorce or other matters of family law.

(3) Documents of title which are filed of record with a governmental unit until such

time that a State or subdivision thereof chooses to accept filings electronically.

(4) Residential landlord-tenant relationships.

(5) The Uniform Health-Care Decisions Act as in effect in a State.

(e) ELECTRONIC AGENTS.—A contract relating to a commercial transaction affecting interstate commerce may not be denied legal effect or enforceability solely because its formation involved—

(1) the interaction of electronic agents of the parties; or

(2) the interaction of an electronic agent of a party and an individual who acts on that individual's own behalf or as an agent for another person.

(f) INSURANCE.—It is the specific intent of the Congress that this section apply to the business of insurance.

(g) APPLICATION IN UETA STATES.—This section does not apply in any State in which the Uniform Electronic Transactions Act is in effect.

SEC. 6. PRINCIPLES GOVERNING THE USE OF ELECTRONIC SIGNATURES IN INTERNATIONAL TRANSACTIONS.

To the extent practicable, the Federal Government shall observe the following principles in an international context to enable commercial electronic transaction:

(1) Remove paper-based obstacles to electronic transactions by adopting relevant principles from the Model Law on Electronic Commerce adopted in 1996 by the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law.

(2) Permit parties to a transaction to determine the appropriate authentication technologies and implementation models for their transactions, with assurance that those technologies and implementation models will be recognized and enforced.

(3) Permit parties to a transaction to have the opportunity to prove in court or other proceedings that their authentication approaches and their transactions are valid.

(4) Take a nondiscriminatory approach to electronic signatures and authentication methods from other jurisdictions.

SEC. 7. STUDY OF LEGAL AND REGULATORY BARRIERS TO ELECTRONIC COMMERCE.

(a) BARRIERS.—Each Federal agency shall, not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, provide a report to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and the Secretary of Commerce identifying any provision of law administered by such agency, or any regulations issued by such agency and in effect on the date of enactment of this Act, that may impose a barrier to electronic transactions, or otherwise to the conduct of commerce online or by electronic means, including barriers imposed by a law or regulation directly or indirectly requiring that signatures, or records of transactions, be accomplished or retained in other than electronic form. In its report, each agency shall identify the barriers among those identified whose removal would require legislative action, and shall indicate agency plans to undertake regulatory action to remove such barriers among those identified as are caused by regulations issued by the agency.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall, within 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, and after the consultation required by subsection (c) of this section, report to the Congress concerning—

(1) legislation needed to remove barriers to electronic transactions or otherwise to the conduct of commerce online or by electronic means; and

(2) actions being taken by the Executive Branch and individual Federal agencies to

remove such barriers as are caused by agency regulations or policies.

(c) CONSULTATION.—In preparing the report required by this section, the Secretary of Commerce shall consult with the General Services Administration, the National Archives and Records Administration, and the Attorney General concerning matters involving the authenticity of records, their storage and retention, and their usability for law enforcement purposes.

(d) INCLUDE FINDINGS IF NO RECOMMENDATIONS.—If the report required by this section omits recommendations for actions needed to fully remove identified barriers to electronic transactions or to online or electronic commerce, it shall include a finding or findings, including substantial reasons therefor, that such removal is impracticable or would be inconsistent with the implementation or enforcement of applicable laws.

TO AMEND THE CONSOLIDATED FARM AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT ACT

S. 961, passed during today's session, follows:

S. 961

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

SECTION 1. SHARED APPRECIATION ARRANGEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 353(e) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 2001(e)) is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) TERMS.—A shared appreciation agreement entered into by a borrower under this subsection shall—

“(A) have a term not to exceed 10 years;

“(B) provide for recapture based on the difference between—

“(i) the appraised value of the real security property at the time of restructuring; and

“(ii) that value at the time of recapture, except that that value shall not include the value of any capital improvements made to the real security property by the borrower after the time of restructuring; and

“(C) allow the borrower to obtain a loan, in addition to any other outstanding loans under this title, to pay any amounts due on a shared appreciation agreement, at a rate of interest that is not greater than the rate of interest on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of a maturity comparable to that of the loan.”.

(b) APPLICATION.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to a shared appreciation arrangement entered into under section 353(e) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 2001(e)) that matures on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

ENERGY AND WATER RELATED MEASURES

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I thank Senator DASCHLE for his work on this next group of bills. It involves a number of energy-related, water-related bills out of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee. I also want to recognize Senator MURKOWSKI, the chairman of the committee.

These are quite often considered to be small bills, but to a number of areas or States or Senators, they are very big in importance. Senator MURKOWSKI and Senator BINGAMAN have worked feverishly to try to get through a num-

ber of problems. It is one of those classic cases where you have one problem that develops with a bill; then it affects other bills. Senator DASCHLE took the time and the lead in working through some of these problems. I want to recognize the work he did.

I also commit publicly on the record to proceed to S. 1051, the Northern Marianas bill, by February 15. We would have liked to have been able to go ahead and get a complete unanimous consent about the total arrangements for it being handled, but Senators who did have questions are now probably on airplanes headed halfway across the country. We will work together. I will make a commitment to bring this up by the 15th.

Does Senator DASCHLE want to make any comment on that?

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I appreciate the commitment made by the majority leader. I know Senator AKAKA is disappointed that it is not in this package of bills. He has worked, along with Senator MURKOWSKI who, I think, may be a cosponsor of this legislation, to pass it tonight. That is impossible. But I think Senator AKAKA is certainly willing to accept the commitment made by the majority leader that by the 15th we will take up this legislation and hopefully resolve it successfully in the not-too-distant future. This is an important bill, the Marianas. It is an important bill for Senator AKAKA, and I am appreciative of the commitment that is now part of the record that we will come back to this bill in a matter of months.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 744

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the majority leader, following consultation with the Democratic leader, proceed to the consideration of S. 744, regarding conveying public lands to the University of Alaska, that immediately after the bill is reported, the committee amendment be agreed to as original text for the purpose of further amendment; and that the bill, as amended, be considered under the following limitations: That there be 4 hours for debate on the bill, equally divided and controlled between the chairman and ranking member, with the only amendments in order as follows: Bingaman, two relevant amendments; and Murkowski, one relevant amendment; that no second-degree or other first-degree amendments be in order, with debate time on the amendments limited to 60 minutes each, equally divided and controlled in the usual form; that upon disposition of all the amendments and the use or yielding back of all time, the bill be read a third time and the Senate proceed to vote on passage of the bill.

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