

6. Requires the National Research Council to conduct a study to assess the desirability of creating public key infrastructures. The study will also address advances in technology required for public key in technology required for public key infrastructure.

7. Establishes a national panel for the purpose of exploring all relevant factors associated with the development of a national digital signature infrastructure based on uniform standards and of developing model practices and standards associated with certification authorities.

All these measures are intended to accomplish two goals. First, assist NIST in meeting the ever-increasing computer security needs of Federal civilian agencies. Second, to allow the Federal Government, through NIST, to harness the ingenuity of the private sector to help address its computer security needs.

Since the passage of the Computer Security Act, the networking revolution has improved the ability of Federal agencies to process and transfer data. It has also made that same data more vulnerable to corruption and theft.

The General Accounting Office (GAO) has highlighted computer security as a government-wide, high-risk issue. GAO specifically identified the lack of adequate security for Federal civilian computer systems as a significant problem. Since June of 1993, the General Accounting Office (GAO) has issued over 30 reports detailing serious information security weaknesses at 24 of our largest Federal agencies.

The Science Committee has held seven hearings on computer security since I became Chairman in 1997. During the hearings, Members of the Science Committee heard from some of the most respected experts in the field. They all agreed that the Federal Government must do more to secure the sensitive electronic data it possesses.

The Federal Government is not alone in its need to secure electronic information. The corruption of electronic data threatens every sector of our economy. The market for high-quality computer security products is enormous, and the U.S. software and hardware industries are responding. The passage of this legislation will enable the Federal Government, through NIST, to benefit from these technological advances.

I look forward to working with all interested parties to advance the Computer Security Enhancement Act of 1999. In my estimation, it is a good bill, and I am hopeful we can move it through the legislative process in short order.

THE COMPUTER SECURITY ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 1999

HON. BART GORDON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1999

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, today, I am pleased to join Chairman SENSENBRENNER in introducing the Computer Security Enhancement Act of 1999. I was an original co-sponsor of similar legislation in the 105th Congress. The measure follows a stream of attacks just this past week on government Web sites including the Senate, White House, the National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration's severe weather warning site, the Defense Department

and the FBI's National Infrastructure Protection Center, whose very purpose is to protect federal sites from such attacks.

The Computer Security Enhancement Act of 1999 will encourage the use of computer security products, both by federal agencies and the private sector, which in turn will support the new electronic economy. I am convinced that we must have trustworthy and secure electronic network systems to foster the growth of electronic commerce. This legislation builds upon the successful track record of the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) in working with industry and other federal agencies to develop a consensus on the necessary standards and protocols required to support electronic commerce.

Chairman SENSENBRENNER has already outlined the provisions of this bill. However, I would like to take a few minutes to explain provisions I added to this legislation that are based on H.R. 1572, the Digital Signature Act of 1999, which I introduced with the support of Chairman SENSENBRENNER on 27 April 1999 to complement last year's Government Paperwork Elimination Act. When I introduced H.R. 1572, I stated that it was a work in progress. Section 13 of the Computer Security Enhancement Act, which we are introducing today, is the result of discussions I have had with industry and federal agencies.

As a result of these discussions, the general provisions in H.R. 1572 have been re-drafted to include all electronic authentication techniques. Section 13 requires NIST, working with industry, to develop minimum technical standards and guidelines for Federal agencies to follow when deploying any electronic authentication technologies. In addition, Section 13 authorizes the Undersecretary of Commerce for Technology to establish a National Policy Panel for Digital Signatures to explore the factors associated with the development of a National Digital Signature Infrastructure based on uniform model guidelines and standards to enable the widespread utilization of digital signatures in the private sector.

I want to highlight that these provisions are technology neutral. Rather they encourage federal agencies to use uniform guidelines and criteria in deploying electronic authentication technologies and to ensure that their systems are interoperable. The provisions also encourage agencies to use commercial off-the-shelf software (COTS) whenever possible to meet their needs. None of these provisions give the Federal government the authority to establish standards or procedures for the private sector.

The use of electronic authentication technologies are critical for the continued growth and security of electronic transactions on the Internet. With the rapid growth of the Internet we have lost the ability to actually "know" who we are communicating with is who they say they are. In order to exchange sensitive documents or to do business transactions with confidence it is important that electronic authentication systems are used that both uniquely identify both the sender and/or the recipient and verify that the information exchanged has not been altered in transit. Electronic authentication is as much of a computer security issue as having good firewalls, strong encryption, and virus scanners.

I want to stress the underlying principle of the Computer Security Enhancement Act of 1999 is that it recognizes that government and private sector computer security needs are

similar. Hopefully the result will be greater security and lower cost for everyone as we increasingly move towards an electronic economy.

The bill we are introducing today is the result of close bipartisan cooperation and it has been a pleasure working with Chairman SENSENBRENNER on this legislation.

I urge my colleagues to support the Computer Security Enhancement Act of 1999.

EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY UTILIZATION EXTENSION ASSISTANCE ACT

HON. JAMES A. BARCIA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1999

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce, along with my friend from Oregon, Mr. Wu, the Educational Technology Utilization Extension Assistance Act. This bill directs the National Science Foundation to work with the Department of Education and the National Institute of Standards and Technology to create educational technology extension centers based at undergraduate institutions. The focus of these centers is to advise and assist local K-12 schools to better utilize and integrate their existing ed-tech infrastructure into their curriculum and classroom.

During my tenure in Congress, much attention has been given to the subject of computers in the classroom and wiring schools for the Internet. These initiatives are often viewed as a panacea for improving test scores, and millions of dollars have been invested in these technologies. Missing from this strategy is any useful, long-term advice on how to best integrate ed-tech into the educational process. In fact, one of the last reports produced by the excellent staff of OTA highlighted the problem of teachers not being effectively trained on how to best use these technologies in the classroom. The same report pointed out that local school officials were often unaware of the substantial infrastructure and operational costs associated with deploying and maintaining these educational technologies.

These findings were echoed by a February 1999 Department of Education report, "Teacher Quality: A Report on the Preparation and Qualification of Public School Teachers." The Department of Education found that only 1 in 5 teachers felt well-prepared to work in a modern classroom. In addition, the most common form of professional development for K-12 teachers are 1-day workshops which have little relevance to classroom activities. Consequently, the full potential of ed-tech has never been fully realized.

The Educational Technology Utilization Assistance Act is an attempt to rectify this gap in the educational infrastructure. This bill does not create a new top-down Federal program, but rather it allows local extension centers to assist local primary schools to better integrate educational technologies into their curriculum. Of course this concept is not new. In fact, it is based on the highly successful Agricultural Extension Service and the Manufacturing Extension Partnership. Both of these programs are model public/private partnerships that use specific solutions to solve unique problems as they are found in the field and rejects the "one

size fits all" approach that is so often associated with federal government programs.

It is my hope that using the extension model, educational technology centers would represent a public-private partnership with the participation of universities, the private sector, state and local governments, and the federal agencies. In this spirit of partnership, the federal share of funding would be limited to 50 percent, thereby ensuring that all stakeholders would have a financial incentive to making the ETU Centers successful.

Once an ETU Center is established, it will be able to tailor its activities to local needs, and, more importantly, to share ETU Center expertise and experience with local schools. For example, activities may include teacher training for new technologies, or integrating the school's existing technology infrastructure into their curriculum; advising teachers, administrators and school boards on criteria for acquisition, utilization, and support of educational technologies; and advising K–12 schools on the skills required by local industry.

Given our rapidly changing economy, it is vital that both teachers and students not only be comfortable with the leading technologies of today, but also receive periodic training to ensure their ability to teach the next generation of technologies. I am confident this legislation will accomplish both of these important goals, as well as help students develop those skills in demand by industries increasingly reliant on technology.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

TRIBUTE TO POLICE CHIEF PETER W. STEPHAN

HON. DAVE CAMP

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1999

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an honorable and noble public servant from Grayling, Mich., Police Chief Peter W. Stephan.

After 41 years of dedicated service, Chief Stephan is retiring. A Grayling native, he began his distinguished career in 1958 as a patrolman for the city. After 14 years, he was promoted to police chief in 1972, marking the beginning of his 27-year tenure.

During his remarkable career, Chief Stephan has held numerous positions of honor including: serving as a member and past president of the Michigan Association of Chiefs of Police, serving as member and president of the Northern Michigan Association of Chiefs of Police, member of the Environmental Crimes Committee, and a member of the Michigan Association of Chiefs of Police Legislative Committee.

Chief Stephan was also instrumental in creating the Crawford County Drug Lab and the Michigan State Police Crime Lab in Grayling.

The achievements and duration of Chief Stephan's career speak for themselves. He is a dedicated community leader, committed to serving and protecting the people of Grayling, ensuring that his city is not just safe, but serves as a model for other communities in Michigan.

Chief Stephan is a shining example of excellence of whom Grayling residents can be

proud. His career is a point of pride for the people of Grayling, who can look to him as an example of a public servant with dignity, pride and exemplary service.

Mr. Speaker, please join me, his family, friends and colleagues in congratulating him.

INTRODUCTION OF THE WORKER PAYCHECK FAIRNESS ACT

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1999

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Worker Paycheck Fairness Act. The bill provides a workable, reasonable mechanism for dealing with the issue of organized labor taking dues money from rank-and-file union members—from members who have to pay dues or they cannot keep their jobs. The legislation in no way changes the manner in which unions can spend money, it simply provides union workers the dignity of being able to give their up-front consent to their union before funds having nothing to do with collective bargaining are taken out of their paychecks.

In the six hearings my Committee held the past few Congresses on the issue of compulsory union dues, we heard from worker after worker telling us about the one thing they each want from their union: the basic respect of being asked for permission before the union spends their money for purposes unrelated to labor-management obligations. Most of these employees were upset over finding out their hard-earned dollars were being funneled into political causes or candidates they did not support. However, most of these workers supported their union and still overwhelmingly believe in the value of organized labor. A number of witnesses were stewards in their union. All they wanted was to be able to give their consent before their union spent their money for activities falling outside collective bargaining and which subvert their deeply held ideas and convictions.

The Worker Paycheck Fairness Act, similar to legislation reported to the House last Congress after passing my Committee on Education and the Workforce by voice vote, simply gives workers this right to give their permission and the right to know how their money is spent. This legislation creates a new, federal right implementing the spirit of the Supreme Court's 1988 Beck decision.

In Beck, the Court held that workers cannot be required to pay for activities beyond legitimate union functions. After hearing testimony from dozens of witnesses, including 14 rank-and-file workers, it is clear to the Committee that Beck rights have remained illusory. The witnesses described problems with lack of notice, the necessity under current law of resigning from the union, procedural hurdles, and notably, the incredible indignities they often endure, including harassment, stonewalling, coercion, and intimidation, when they attempt to exercise their rights granted under Beck.

This legislation applies only where unions require workers to pay dues as a condition of keeping their jobs. This mandate is called a "union security agreement," and such agreements are currently legal in 29 states. Simply put, a union security agreement forces a work-

er to pay an agency fee to the union, or the worker has no right to work. This bill is necessary, Mr. Speaker, because unions are taking money from the pockets of employees working under such security agreements and spending it on activities having nothing to do with a union's legitimate activities.

In addition to requiring consent, the Worker Paycheck Fairness Act requires employers whose employees are represented by a union to post a notice telling workers of their right under this legislation to give their consent. It also amends the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 to ensure that workers will know what their money is being spent on. Under this change, unions would have to report expenses by "functional classification" on the LM-forms they are currently required to file annually with the Department of Labor. This change was proposed by the Bush administration in 1992 but eliminated by the Clinton administration.

This legislation also puts real enforcement into place, as those whose rights are violated would be entitled to double damages and attorney's fees and costs—similar to relief available under the Family and Medical Leave Act. Finally, Mr. Speaker, the bill includes a common employment law provision making it illegal for a union to retaliate against or coerce anyone exercising his or her consent rights. This applies to all employees—union members and non-members alike—and under the provision, a union may not discriminate against any worker for giving, or not giving, their consent.

This bill is all the more necessary, Mr. Speaker, because there are those in Congress who are pushing campaign finance reform legislation which purports to codify Beck, but which actually represents a step backwards for working men and women.

Section 501 of the Shays/Meehan reform bill, H.R. 417, entitled "Codification of Beck Decision," does nothing of the sort. Section 501 is a sugar-coated placebo that diminishes the Beck decision and does nothing to correct the current injustices in our federal labor law relating to unions' use of their members' hard-earned paychecks. My Committee's many hearings have shown that the current law in this area does not work because it does not adequately protect workers. A close reading of Section 501 shows not only that the provision does not codify Beck, but that it is in fact a step backwards from codifying current law. Section 501 is so favorable to unions that organized labor could not have done a better job drafting it themselves.

First, Section 501 provides absolutely no notice of rights to members of the union—it applies only to non-members. Second, Section 501 redefines the dues payments that may be objected to, by limiting such to "expenditures in connection with a Federal, State, or local election or in connection with efforts to influence legislation unrelated to collective bargaining." This definition not only infers that there may be other types of political expenditures to which workers cannot object—a perversion of Beck—but it also ignores Beck's holding that workers may object to any dues payments for any union activities not directly related to collective bargaining activities. Section 501 would cut back even further on the already illusory rights workers supposedly have today under Beck.

If Congress is truly going to try to deal with the issue of organized labor taking dues