York showroom when it opened in 1962. He often told a story of how ashamed he was on November 19, 1999.

In the 1980’s, when Japan seemed on top of the world, Mr. Morita was among the most vocal of the Japanese executives in criticizing American business and hail ing the success of the Japanese model. He said American managers were financial paper shufflers who “can see only 10 minutes ahead” and were not interested in building for the long term. He said that Sony was suffering from the “paper shuffler syndrome,” which prevented it from making a movie critical of Japan’s emperor. “Japan Invades Hollywood” read the cover of the book. It was later that year that Sony paid $3.4 billion to buy Columbia Pictures, a purchase driven largely by Mr. Morita, who thought that if Sony had owned a studio issuing movies generally in the chapters Mr. Ishihara wrote, the book had not been intended for an American audience. And he refused to authorize an English translation. He had spent much of his time since then arguing that the world balance of power was being lost as America retreated to its own borders and the United States was abandoning its status as an industrial power. “There are few things in the United States that Americans want to buy, but they buy a lot of things in Japan that Americans want to buy,” he wrote in 1989. “This is at the root of the trade imbalance. The problem arises in that most American executives fail to understand this simple fact.”

In 1989, Mr. Morita was the co-author, along with a nationalist politician, Shintaro Ishihara, of “That Can Say No,” a book that urged Japan to stand up to American trade demands, which it said were motivated partly by racism. The book also said Japanese executives were unable to change the world balance of power by selling its advanced computer chips to the Soviet Union instead of the United States. Even the most critical president remarks were generally in the chapters Mr. Ishihara wrote, saying the book had not been intended for an American audience. And he refused to authorize an English translation.

It was later that year that Sony paid $3.4 billion to buy Columbia Pictures, a purchase driven largely by Mr. Morita, who thought that if Sony had owned a studio issuing movies in the Beta format, it would not have lost the VCR wars.

Although Sony prided itself on being more Americanized than its Japanese rivals, the purchase became a lightning rod for an anti-Japanese feeling in the United States. “Japan Invades Hollywood” read the cover of the movie. In Japan as well, Sony came in for criticism for stirring up anti-Japanese sentiment, especially in Hollywood. Sony is generally considered to have overestimated the need for public relations and paid less than $3 billion for the movie rights. Mr. Morita himself expressed regret over the purchase.

Morita and his successor as Sony chief executive, Norio Ohga, perhaps because they were worried about stirring up anti-Japanese sentiments, eventually closed the studio.

In late 1994, in one of the most embarrassing moments in its history, Sony announced that it would suffer a loss of $3.2 billion from its investment in Hollywood. But it has stuck with the studio, now called Sony Pictures Entertainment, and appears to be turning it around.

The Morita name will live on at Sony because many members of Mr. Morita’s family are involved in the company.

Besides his wife, Mr. Morita is survived by his wife, Yoshiko Morita, who now runs the take out shop. His daughter, Naoiko Okada, who also lives in Japan. He is also survived by his brother Kazuaki, who volunteered to take over the family sake brewery in Morita’s stead; another brother, Masaaki, a long-time Sony executive, and a sister, Kikuko Iwama, who was married to the late Kazuo Iwama, a former president of Sony.

TRIBUTE TO SISTER ELIZABETH CANDON

- Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. President, it is with great pleasure that I rise today in honor of an extraordinary Vermont woman, Sister Elizabeth Candon. On January 1, 2001, Sister Elizabeth will retire from her post as Professor of English at Trinity College, and from a long career in public service. Whether in the role of teacher, college President, public official, Sister Elizabeth has been a steadfast leader for women and a true advocate for those in need. She is and will remain a stunning example of how one person can positively affect so many.

In 1939, Sister Elizabeth Candon began her life of public service when she became a Religious Sister of Mercy. Educated at Trinity College and Fordham University, Sister Elizabeth started her career in 1964, when she returned to her alma mater as an Associate Professor of English and Director of Admissions. In 1966, she became a full Professor of English and Trinity College’s President, a post she would hold until 1976.

During this time, Sister Elizabeth left the world of academia to try her hand at state government. At the request of Vermont’s Governor, Richard Snelling, Sister Elizabeth took the helm of Vermont’s largest agency as Secretary of Human Services. But she left Vermont history to serve as Secretary and the only woman in the Governor’s cabinet, Sister Elizabeth quickly became a role model for Vermont women. Her tenure as Secretary also provided her with an opportunity to effect change and help those in need.

Under her leadership, community based programs were developed and as a result, the Windsor State Prison and Vergennes’ ‘Week’s School were both closed. This restructuring allowed the beneficial programs administered at these sites to be relocated throughout the state.

Sister Elizabeth was and continues to be tireless in her efforts to institute programs on behalf of those in need of mental health and developmental disabilities services. To this day she is remembered for her motto, “anything is possible if it matters not who gets the credit.” Consequently, this legacy has woven its way into the mission of the Agency of Human Services.

Since returning to teaching at Trinity as Professor of English in 1983, Sister Elizabeth has continued to bring the beauty and inspiration of Shakespeare and Chaucer to her students. Throughout her career, her steadfast leadership in community and public service has continued.

I should also acknowledge that throughout her career, Sister Elizabeth has served on many boards and Councils, further extending her influence on the issues important to her and to Vermonters. She sat on the Vermont Council on the Humanities and Public Issues, the Board of Directors for the United Community Service of Chittenden County, and the Board of Directors of Howard Mental Health Services. She also served as Trustee of Middlebury College and as Chairperson of the State Task Force on Funding for
Sec. 2. Purposes.

The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to protect the integrity of the food stamp program;

(2) to ensure cost-effective portability of food stamp benefits across State borders without imposing additional administrative expenses for special equipment to address problems relating to the portability;

(3) to enhance the flow of interstate commerce involving electronic transactions involving food stamp benefits under a uniform national standard of interoperability and portability; and

(4) to eliminate the inefficiencies resulting from a patchwork of State-administered systems and regulations established to carry out the food stamp program.

Sec. 3. Interoperability and Portability of Electronic Benefit Transfer Transactions.

Section 7 of the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2016) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(k) Interoperability and Portability of Electronic Benefit Transfer Transactions.—"

"(1) Definitions.—In this subsection:

(A) ELECTRONIC BENEFIT TRANSFER CARD.—The term ‘electronic benefit transfer card’ means a card that provides benefits under this Act through an electronic benefit transfer service (as defined in subsection (i)(1)(A)).

(B) ELECTRONIC BENEFIT TRANSFER CONTRACT.—The term ‘electronic benefit transfer contract’ means a contract that provides for the issuance, use, or redemption of coupons in the form of electronic benefit transfer cards.

(C) INTEROPERABILITY.—The term ‘interoperability’ means a system that enables a coupon issued in the form of an electronic benefit transfer card to be redeemed in any State.

(D) INTERSTATE TRANSACTION.—The term ‘interstate transaction’ means a transaction that is initiated in 1 State by the use of an electronic benefit transfer card that is issued in another State.

(E) PORTABILITY.—The term ‘portability’ means a system that enables a coupon issued in the form of an electronic benefit transfer card to be redeemed in any State.

(F) SETTLING.—The term ‘settling’ means the routing of an interstate transaction that consists of transmitting the details of a transaction electronically recorded through the use of an electronic benefit transfer card in 1 State to the issuer of the card that is in another State.

(G) SMART CARD.—The term ‘smart card’ means an intelligent benefit card described in section 17(f).

(h) SWITCHING.—The term ‘switching’ means the routing of an interstate transaction that consists of transmitting the details of a transaction electronically recorded through the use of an electronic benefit transfer card in 1 State to the issuer of the card that is in another State.

(2) REQUIREMENT.—Not later than October 1, 2002, the Secretary shall ensure that systems that provide for the issuance, use, or redemption of coupons in the form of electronic benefit transfer cards are interoperable, and food stamp benefits are portable, among all States.

(3) COST.—The cost of achieving the interoperability and portability required under paragraph (2) shall not be imposed on any food stamp retail store, or any wholesale food concern, approved to participate in the food stamp program.

(4) STANDARDS.—Not later than 210 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall promulgate regulations that—

(A) adopt a uniform national standard of interoperability and portability required under paragraph (2) based on the standard of interoperability and portability used by a majority of State agencies; and

(B) require that any electronic benefit transfer contract that is entered into on or after the date that is 30 days after the regulations are promulgated, by or on behalf of a State agency, provide for the interoperability and portability required under paragraph (2) in accordance with the national standard.

(5) EXEMPTIONS.—

(A) CONTRACTS.—The requirements of paragraph (2) shall not apply to the transmission 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 (i), 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); and

(ii) determines 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.

(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 TRANSFER TRANSACTIONS INVOLVING FOOD STAMP BENEFITS.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a study of alternative means to handle 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 threshold 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 taking their proven role as laboratories of innovation for quickly evolving areas of public policy, provided that States...