

“agreement,” means a leniency letter agreement, whether conditional or final, between a person and the Antitrust Division pursuant to the Corporate Leniency Policy of the Antitrust Division in effect on the date of execution of the agreement.

(3) ANTITRUST LENIENCY APPLICANT.—The term “antitrust leniency applicant,” or “applicant,” means, with respect to an antitrust leniency agreement, the person that has entered into the agreement.

(4) CLAIMANT.—The term “claimant” means a person or class, that has brought, or on whose behalf has been brought, a civil action alleging a violation of section 1 or 3 of the Sherman Act or any similar State law, except that the term does not include a State or a subdivision of a State with respect to a civil action brought to recover damages sustained by the State or subdivision.

(5) COOPERATING INDIVIDUAL.—The term “cooperating individual” means, with respect to an antitrust leniency agreement, a current or former director, officer, or employee of the antitrust leniency applicant who is covered by the agreement.

(6) PERSON.—The term “person” has the meaning given it in subsection (a) of the first section of the Clayton Act.

SEC. 213. LIMITATION ON RECOVERY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (d), in any civil action alleging a violation of section 1 or 3 of the Sherman Act, or alleging a violation of any similar State law, based on conduct covered by a currently effective antitrust leniency agreement, the amount of damages recovered by or on behalf of a claimant from an antitrust leniency applicant who satisfies the requirements of subsection (b), together with the amounts so recovered from cooperating individuals who satisfy such requirements, shall not exceed that portion of the actual damages sustained by such claimant which is attributable to the commerce done by the applicant in the goods or services affected by the violation.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—Subject to subsection (c), an antitrust leniency applicant or cooperating individual satisfies the requirements of this subsection with respect to a civil action described in subsection (a) if the court in which the civil action is brought determines, after considering any appropriate pleadings from the claimant, that the applicant or cooperating individual, as the case may be, has provided satisfactory cooperation to the claimant with respect to the civil action, which cooperation shall include—

(1) providing a full account to the claimant of all facts known to the applicant or cooperating individual, as the case may be, that are potentially relevant to the civil action;

(2) furnishing all documents or other items potentially relevant to the civil action that are in the possession, custody, or control of the applicant or cooperating individual, as the case may be, wherever they are located; and

(3)(A) in the case of a cooperating individual—

(i) making himself or herself available for such interviews, depositions, or testimony in connection with the civil action as the claimant may reasonably require; and

(ii) responding completely and truthfully, without making any attempt either falsely to protect or falsely to implicate any person or entity, and without intentionally withholding any potentially relevant information, to all questions asked by the claimant in interviews, depositions, trials, or any other court proceedings in connection with the civil action; or

(B) in the case of an antitrust leniency applicant, using its best efforts to secure and facilitate from cooperating individuals covered by the agreement the cooperation de-

scribed in clauses (i) and (ii) and subparagraph (A).

(c) TIMELINESS.—If the initial contact by the antitrust leniency applicant with the Antitrust Division regarding conduct covered by the antitrust leniency agreement occurs after a State, or subdivision of a State, has issued compulsory process in connection with an investigation of allegations of a violation of section 1 or 3 of the Sherman Act or any similar State law based on conduct covered by the antitrust leniency agreement or after a civil action described in subsection (a) has been filed, then the court shall consider, in making the determination concerning satisfactory cooperation described in subsection (b), the timeliness of the applicant’s initial cooperation with the claimant.

(d) CONTINUATION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to modify, impair, or supersede the provisions of sections 4, 4A, and 4C of the Clayton Act relating to the recovery of costs of suit, including a reasonable attorney’s fee, and interest on damages, to the extent that such recovery is authorized by such sections.

SEC. 214. RIGHTS, AUTHORITIES, AND LIABILITIES NOT AFFECTED.

Nothing in this subtitle shall be construed to—

(1) affect the rights of the Antitrust Division to seek a stay or protective order in a civil action based on conduct covered by an antitrust leniency agreement to prevent the cooperation described in section 213(b) from impairing or impeding the investigation or prosecution by the Antitrust Division of conduct covered by the agreement;

(2) create any right to challenge any decision by the Antitrust Division with respect to an antitrust leniency agreement; or

(3) affect, in any way, the joint and several liability of any party to a civil action described in section 213(a), other than that of the antitrust leniency applicant and cooperating individuals as provided in section 213(a) of this title.

SEC. 215. INCREASED PENALTIES FOR ANTI-TRUST VIOLATIONS.

(a) RESTRAINT OF TRADE AMONG THE STATES.—Section 1 of the Sherman Act (15 U.S.C. 1) is amended by—

(1) striking “\$10,000,000” and inserting “\$100,000,000”;

(2) striking “\$350,000” and inserting “\$1,000,000”; and

(3) striking “three” and inserting “10”.

(b) MONOPOLIZING TRADE.—Section 2 of the Sherman Act (15 U.S.C. 2) is amended by—

(1) striking “\$10,000,000” and inserting “\$100,000,000”;

(2) striking “\$350,000” and inserting “\$1,000,000”; and

(3) striking “three” and inserting “10”.

(c) OTHER RESTRAINTS OF TRADE.—Section 3 of the Sherman Act (15 U.S.C. 3) is amended by—

(1) striking “\$10,000,000” and inserting “\$100,000,000”;

(2) striking “\$350,000” and inserting “\$1,000,000”; and

(3) striking “three” and inserting “10”.

Subtitle B—Tunney Act Reform

SEC. 221. PUBLIC INTEREST DETERMINATION.

(a) CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSES.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(A) the purpose of the Tunney Act was to ensure that the entry of antitrust consent judgments is in the public interest; and

(B) it would misconstrue the meaning and Congressional intent in enacting the Tunney Act to limit the discretion of district courts to review antitrust consent judgments solely to determining whether entry of those consent judgments would make a “mockery of the judicial function”.

(2) PURPOSES.—The purpose of this section is to effectuate the original Congressional intent in enacting the Tunney Act and to ensure that United States settlements of civil antitrust suits are in the public interest.

(b) PUBLIC INTEREST DETERMINATION.—Section 5 of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 16) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d), by inserting at the end the following: “Upon application by the United States, the district court may, for good cause (based on a finding that the expense of publication in the Federal Register exceeds the public interest benefits to be gained from such publication), authorize an alternative method of public dissemination of the public comments received and the response to those comments.”;

(2) in subsection (e)—

(A) in the matter before paragraph (1), by—

(i) striking “court may” and inserting “court shall”; and

(ii) inserting “(1)” before “Before”; and

(B) striking paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting the following:

“(A) the competitive impact of such judgment, including termination of alleged violations, provisions for enforcement and modification, duration of relief sought, anticipated effects of alternative remedies actually considered, whether its terms are ambiguous, and any other competitive considerations bearing upon the adequacy of such judgment that the court deems necessary to a determination of whether the consent judgment is in the public interest; and

“(B) the impact of entry of such judgment upon competition in the relevant market or markets, upon the public generally and individuals alleging specific injury from the violations set forth in the complaint including consideration of the public benefit, if any, to be derived from a determination of the issues at trial.

“(2) Nothing in this section shall be construed to require the court to conduct an evidentiary hearing or to require the court to permit anyone to intervene.”;

(3) in subsection (g), by inserting “by any officer, director, employee, or agent of such defendant” before “, or other person”.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERGING THREATS AND CAPABILITIES

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 2, 2004, at 9:30 a.m., in open and closed session to receive testimony on the Department of Defense Counter Narcotics Program in review of the Defense authorization request for fiscal year 2005.

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE—S. 2207

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, with respect to the previously filed cloture motion, I ask unanimous consent that the live quorum under rule XXII be waived, and further that notwithstanding rule XXII the vote on the motion to invoke cloture occur at 2:15 on Wednesday, April 7.

Mr. REID. No objection.

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

AUTHORIZATION TO SETTLE CLAIMS ARISING OUT OF DISCOVERY OF LETHAL RICIN POWDER IN SENATE COMPLEX

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 329, which was introduced by Senators LOTT and DODD earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 329) authorizing the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate to ascertain and settle claims arising out of the discovery of lethal ricin powder in the Senate Complex.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to this matter be printed in the RECORD.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 329) was agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 329

Resolved,

SECTION 1. PAYMENT OF CLAIMS ARISING FROM THE RICIN DISCOVERY.

(a) SETTLEMENT AND PAYMENT.—The Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate—

(1) in accordance with such regulations as the Committee on Rules and Administration may prescribe, consider, and ascertain any claim incident to service by a Member, officer, or employee of the Senate for any damage to, or loss of, personal property, for which the Member, officer, or employee has not been reimbursed, resulting from the discovery of lethal ricin powder in the Senate Complex on February 2, 2004, or the related remediation efforts undertaken as a result of that discovery; and

(2) may, with the approval of the Committee on Rules and Administration and in accordance with the provisions of section 3721 of title 31, United States Code, determine, compromise, adjust, and settle such claim in an amount not exceeding \$4,000 per claimant.

(b) FILING OF CLAIMS.—Claimants shall file claims pursuant to this resolution with the Sergeant at Arms not later than July 31, 2004.

(c) USE OF CONTINGENT FUND.—Any compromise, adjustment, or settlement of any such claim pursuant to this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate on a voucher approved by the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION ADVANCEMENT ACT OF 2003

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to

the immediate consideration of Cal-endar No. 376, H.R. 1086.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1086) to encourage the development and promulgation of volunteer consensus standards by providing relief under the antitrust laws to standards development organizations with respect to conduct engaged in for the purpose of developing voluntary consensus standards, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

[Strike the part shown in black brackets and insert the part shown in italic.]

H.R. 1086

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 "Standards Development Organization Advancement Act of 2003".]

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

[The Congress finds the following:

[(1) In 1993, the Congress amended and renamed the National Cooperative Research Act of 1984 (now known as the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993 (15 U.S.C. 4301 et seq.)) by enacting the National Cooperative Production Amendments of 1993 (Public Law 103-42) to encourage the use of collaborative, procompetitive activity in the form of research and production joint ventures that provide adequate disclosure to the antitrust enforcement agencies about the nature and scope of the activity involved.

[(2) Subsequently, in 1995, the Congress in enacting the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. 272 note) recognized the importance of technical standards developed by voluntary consensus standards bodies to our national economy by requiring the use of such standards to the extent practicable by Federal agencies and by encouraging Federal agency representatives to participate in ongoing standards development activities. The Office of Management and Budget on February 18, 1998, revised Circular A-119 to reflect these changes made in law.

[(3) Following enactment of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995, technical standards developed or adopted by voluntary consensus standards bodies have replaced thousands of unique Government standards and specifications allowing the national economy to operate in a more unified fashion.

[(4) Having the same technical standards used by Federal agencies and by the private sector permits the Government to avoid the cost of developing duplicative Government standards and to more readily use products and components designed for the commercial marketplace, thereby enhancing quality and safety and reducing costs.

[(5) Technical standards are written by hundreds of nonprofit voluntary consensus standards bodies in a nonexclusionary fashion, using thousands of volunteers from the private and public sectors, and are developed under the standards development principles set out in Circular Number A-119, as revised February 18, 1998, of the Office of Manage-

ment and Budget, including principles that require openness, balance, transparency, consensus, and due process. Such principles provide for—

[(A) notice to all parties known to be affected by the particular standards development activity,

[(B) the opportunity to participate in standards development or modification,

[(C) balancing interests so that standards development activities are not dominated by any single group of interested persons,

[(D) readily available access to essential information regarding proposed and final standards,

[(E) the requirement that substantial agreement be reached on all material points after the consideration of all views and objections, and

[(F) the right to express a position, to have it considered, and to appeal an adverse decision.

[(6) There are tens of thousands of voluntary consensus standards available for government use. Most of these standards are kept current through interim amendments and interpretations, issuance of addenda, and periodic reaffirmation, revision, or reissuance every 3 to 5 years.

[(7) Standards developed by government entities generally are not subject to challenge under the antitrust laws.

[(8) Private developers of the technical standards that are used as Government standards are often not similarly protected, leaving such developers vulnerable to being named as codefendants in lawsuits even though the likelihood of their being held liable is remote in most cases, and they generally have limited resources to defend themselves in such lawsuits.

[(9) Standards development organizations do not stand to benefit from any antitrust violations that might occur in the voluntary consensus standards development process.

[(10) As was the case with respect to research and production joint ventures before the passage of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, if relief from the threat of liability under the antitrust laws is not granted to voluntary consensus standards bodies, both regarding the development of new standards and efforts to keep existing standards current, such bodies could be forced to cut back on standards development activities at great financial cost both to the Government and to the national economy.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

[Section 2 of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993 (15 U.S.C. 4301) is amended—

[(1) in subsection (a) by adding at the end the following:

["(7) The term 'standards development activity' means any action taken by a standards development organization for the purpose of developing, promulgating, revising, amending, reissuing, interpreting, or otherwise maintaining a voluntary consensus standard, or using such standard in conformity assessment activities, including actions relating to the intellectual property policies of the standards development organization.

["(8) The term 'standards development organization' means a domestic or international organization that plans, develops, establishes, or coordinates voluntary consensus standards using procedures that incorporate the attributes of openness, balance of interests, due process, an appeals process, and consensus in a manner consistent with the Office of Management and Budget Circular Number A-119, as revised February 10, 1998.

["(9) The term 'technical standard' has the meaning given such term in section 12(d)(4)