

state senator and governor before being elected to the United States Senate in 1974.

Each of us understands that our primary job as Senators is to make the law, but many of us also believe that we should use our offices to help the people of our states. This is a sentiment that Senator FORD and I share, and over the years, my friend from Kentucky has worked tirelessly to help his state develop and prosper. While Kentucky, like South Carolina, is still a largely rural state, thanks in no small part to the efforts of WENDELL FORD, the people of Kentucky are enjoying opportunities and economic growth that has been substantial.

During his time in Washington, Senator FORD has held a number of key positions, both in the Senate and in political organizations. His leadership roles as an Assistant Leader and a former Committee Chairman stand as testament to both his abilities and the regard in which he is held by his peers.

I am certain that Senator FORD did not easily come to the decision to retire, but I am certain that he and his lovely wife Jean are looking forward to their new life. I wish both of them health, happiness and success in whatever endeavor they undertake.

#### RETIREMENT OF SENATOR DALE BUMPERS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, one of the things that makes the Senate such a unique and enjoyable place to work is the fact that there are 100 unique personalities that make up this institution. While each member takes his or her duties seriously, I hope that I do not offend anyone when I say that not all are gifted orators. One person who definitely can engage in articulate and compelling debate, and is also able to bring a little levity to our proceedings through his wit and ability to tell a story is the Senator from Arkansas, DALE BUMPERS.

First elected to the Senate in 1974, Senator BUMPERS arrived with an already well established and well deserved reputation for having a commitment to serving his constituents and our Nation. He served in the United States Marine Corps during World War II, as well as the Governor of Arkansas, having been elected to that post in 1970. Clearly, his training as the chief executive of his home State, along with experiences as a trial lawyer, gave him the skills that would make him an effective and respected Senator.

For the past more than 20-years, Senator BUMPERS has worked hard to represent his State, and in doing so, has made many valuable contributions to the U.S. Senate. I regret that we have not shared any committee assignments, but I have always respected and valued the opinions of the Senator from Arkansas. His exit from the Senate leaves this institution without one of its most impressive and effective advocates.

I am certain that DALE and his lovely wife Betty will enjoy the more deliberate lifestyle and pace that bring out of politics will afford them and I wish the both of them health, happiness and success in the years ahead.

#### SECRETARY OF THE NAVY JOHN H. DALTON

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, as the framers of the Constitution worked to lay out the foundation of the United States, they very wisely decided that the military forces of this nation should be subservient to civilian leadership. For the past 224 years, this arrangement has worked well proving the wisdom of the men who drafted the document that serves as the cornerstone of our democracy and government.

One of the reasons that civilian leadership of the military has worked so well is because Presidents search tirelessly to find qualified individuals to fill the critical positions of the service secretaries. If we were to look across the Potomac and into the "E" ring of the Pentagon, we would find a group of selfless men and women serving as the civilian leadership of America's armed forces. One of those individuals is Secretary of the Navy John H. Dalton, who will be stepping down from his position at the end of this year.

When John Dalton raised his right hand on July 22, 1993, swore his oath and became the 70th Secretary of the Navy, he came to the office well trained to discharge the duties of his new office. Not only was he a successful corporate executive with invaluable experience in managing a large organization, he graduated from the United States Naval Academy and served as an officer aboard the submarines USS Blueback and USS John C. Calhoun. Additionally, he served in the Carter Administration as a member and chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

The challenges of essentially being the first post-Cold War Secretary of the Navy were significant. Secretary Dalton had the unenviable task of being responsible for the reshaping of the Navy and the Marine Corps to meet the security needs of the United States in a world that is no longer bi-polar. Under his direction, the Navy and the Marine Corps implemented the new doctrines of "Forward, From the Sea: Anytime, Anywhere", and "Operational Maneuver from the Sea", both which will help America meet its short and long-term tactical and strategic needs. Furthermore, Secretary Dalton worked to achieve acquisition initiatives seeking to establish practices resulting in the procurement of the best equipment for our sailors and marines, at the fairest cost to the taxpayer. The new attack submarine teaming arrangement, the DDG-51 multi-year procurement, and the testing and evaluation of the F/A-18 E/F are all examples of such successful endeavors.

Unquestionably, the Navy and Marine Corps that Secretary Dalton will turn over to his successor are institutions that have benefitted from the leadership of this charismatic and kind Texan. His efforts have earned him the respect and accolades of people in the Congress, in the Executive Branch, in industry, in academia, and around the world, and even resulted in his being awarded with the National Security Caucus' prestigious International Leadership Award in 1997. He is the first service secretary to be recognized in this manner and his winning this award is a testament to the regard in which he is held.

Mr. President, I have worked with a lot of service secretaries in my almost 45 years in this body and I say without reservation that John Dalton is one of the finest individuals to have ever served in that capacity. He is a man of honor, ability, and dedication and he will certainly be missed. I know that everyone in this chamber joins me in wishing him "fair winds and following seas" as he completes his public service to the Department of the Navy and the United States of America.

#### PASSAGE OF THE YEAR 2000 INFORMATION AND READINESS DISCLOSURE ACT, S. 2392

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the Y2K bill demonstrates successful bipartisanship and cooperation, and how well Congress can work together when it wants to. Under the leadership of Vice President GORE, Senators HATCH, BENNETT, DODD, THOMPSON, KYL and I, along with others, have worked with the Administration and the House of Representatives to create and pass this legislation. I thank them for their hard work and dedication to this issue.

Four-hundred and forty-nine days from now, millions of computers controlling our air traffic, recording stock and credit card transactions, running electric and telephone systems, tracking bank deposits and monitoring hospital patients may crash in befuddlement. All of this is due to the short-sighted omission of a couple of digits, a one and a nine, from computer chips. Passage of this bill is a signal to the world that by acting now, we can work together to avoid these problems.

The Year 2000 Information and Readiness Disclosure Act will not eliminate the millennium bug—regrettably, no legislation could do that. However, it will greatly increase the chances that industry, university and government experts will work cooperatively to come up with the solutions.

One of the scariest aspects of the Y2K bug has been the silence of businesses and industries in the face of this common enemy. Liability concerns have muted industry experts, dashing the best hopes for developing fixes for this problem. The Year 2000 Information and Readiness Disclosure Act was designed to overcome this isolation and create a free flow of constructive information.

The Year 2000 Information and Readiness Disclosure Act will encourage the sharing of knowledge and working together to create solutions. This bill does not give companies liability protection for their products or services. Rather, for a limited time it will provide adjusted procedures for the exchange of Year 2000 information. This is our best bet to ensuring that services and products will continue operating after midnight on December 31, 1999.

This bill also includes a provision I proposed that will assist consumers, small businesses and local governments. It charters a national information clearinghouse and website as a starting point to provide rapid and accurate information about solving Y2K problems. This will be a needed tool for small businesses, local governments and citizens so they can prepare for the millennium.

I want to thank the President and Vice President for their foresight in this issue, and the corporate leaders who worked together with us to get this done. Major industries—from telecommunications, electric, computer, transportation, energy, health, insurance and many others—pitched in and listened to each other and worked together. I congratulate and thank Senators for their unanimous support for this measure. It is reassuring to know that even in the midst of other dramas, Congress can come together to tackle fundamental issues confronting our national economy and security. I look forward to the President signing this important legislation.

#### NEXT GENERATION INTERNET RESEARCH ACT OF 1998

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am delighted that last night the Senate took up and passed H.R. 3332.

I first introduced my domain name study bill, S. 1727, on March 6, 1998. It was cosponsored by Senator ASHCROFT on May 21, 1998 and passed the Senate on June 26, 1998 as an amendment to S. 1609, Senate legislation to authorize the Next Generation Internet program. The House passed a very similar domain name study bill on September 14, 1998 as part of H.R. 3332, its legislation to authorize the Next Generation Internet program. The Senate Judiciary Committee reported out a substitute amendment to S. 1727 on September 17, 1998 that was identical to the domain name study language that is in H.R. 3332. Now, with the Senate passage of H.R. 3332, the domain name study language will be presented to the President for his signature into law.

The Leahy/Ashcroft domain name study legislation that is incorporated into H.R. 3332 authorizes the National Research Council (NRC) of the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a comprehensive study of the effects on trademark rights of adding new generic top level domain names (gTLDs), and related dispute resolution procedures.

When I first introduced this bill in March, it was, in part, a response to the Administration's Green Paper released on January 30, 1988, on the domain name system (DNS), which suggested the addition of five new generic Top Level Domains (gTLDs).

Although adding new gTLDs, as the Green Paper proposed, would allow more competition and more individuals and businesses to obtain addresses that more closely reflect their names and functions, I was concerned as were many businesses, that the increase in gTLDs would make the job of protecting their trademarks from infringement or dilution more difficult. In addition, increasing the number of gTLDs without an efficient dispute resolution mechanism had the potential of fueling litigation and the threat of litigation, with an overall chilling effect on the choice and use of domain names.

The Green Paper properly raised the important questions of how to protect consumers' interests in locating the brand or vendor of their choice on the Internet without being deceived or confused, how to protect companies from having their brand equity diluted in an electronic environment, and how to resolve disputes efficiently and inexpensively. It did not, however, answer these complex and important questions. Dictating the introduction of new gTLDs without analyzing the impact that these new gTLDs would have on trademark rights and related dispute resolution procedures seemed like putting the cart before the horse.

The Leahy/Ashcroft domain name study bill is intended to put the horse back before the cart. We should understand the effects on trademark rights of adding new gTLDs and related dispute resolution procedures before we move to add significant numbers of new gTLDs. Since its introduction in March, groups such as ATT, Bell Atlantic, Time Warner, the International Trademark Association, the Information Technology Industry Council, the Motion Picture Association of America, the Domain Name Rights Coalition, and the American Intellectual Property Law Association, amongst others, have endorsed this legislation reflected in the Leahy-Ashcroft domain name study bill.

The Administration's White Paper, released on June 5, 1988, backed off the Green Paper's earlier suggestion to add five new gTLDs. Instead, the White Paper proposes that the new corporation would be the most appropriate body to make decisions as to how many, if any, new gTLDs should be added once it has global input, including from the study called for in the Leahy-Ashcroft domain name bill. Specifically, the White Paper calls upon the World Intellectual Property Organization, *inter alia*, to "evaluate the effects, based on studies conducted by independent organizations, such as the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences, of adding new gTLDs, and related dispute resolu-

tion procedures on trademark and intellectual property holders."

I commend the Administration for the deliberate approach it has taken to facilitate the withdrawal of the U.S. government from the governance of the Internet and to privatize the management of Internet names and addresses. We should have a Hippocratic Oath for the Internet—that before we adopt any new regimen that affects the Internet, we should make sure we are doing no harm to this dynamic medium.

In order for the WIPO study to be able to evaluate the effects, based on studies conducted by independent organizations, such as the NRC, of adding new gTLDs and related dispute resolution procedures on trademark rights, the Leahy/Ashcroft domain name study legislation in H.R. 3332 instructs the NRC to release an interim report that can be considered before the release of the March 1, 1999 WIPO study. I believe it beneficial, however, for the final report of the NRC to still be released after the WIPO study, so that the NRC can take into account the results and recommendations offered by the WIPO study and offer its comments on the WIPO study.

One might ask whether the NRC report is necessary, given the fact that WIPO will also be doing a study. I believe that the answer is a resounding "yes". Since the Internet is an outgrowth of U.S. government investments carried out under agreements with U.S. agencies, major components of the DNS are still performed by or subject to agreements with U.S. agencies. Examples include assignments of numerical addresses to Internet users, management of the system of registering names for Internet users, operation of the root server system, and protocol assignment. Although U.S. government management of the Internet's most basic functions will soon be phased out, it is still not clear who will be running the new nonprofit corporation which, according to the Administration's White Paper, will oversee the domain name system. Moreover, the U.S. leads the world in the creation and dissemination of intellectual property. Given the U.S. interests that are at stake and the uncertainty in who will run the domain name system and how it will affect U.S. stakeholders, I think it important that a U.S. entity examine the issue of adding new gTLDs and related dispute resolution procedures on trademark rights. As important as it is for WIPO to benefit from an objective U.S. entity's perspective on this matter, I also think that an objective U.S. entity should be tasked with considering whatever recommendations are issued by WIPO.

I am therefore pleased that the Senate passed H.R. 3332 last night with the Leahy/Ashcroft domain name study bill.

#### THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Thursday,