

A legitimate inventor of a significant concept would be dramatically hindered from seeking venture capital for something that is tied up in the courts by a third party reexamination, as is allowed and envisioned under H.R. 1886.

□ 1600

It enables a third-party requester to challenge as many patents in the courts as it deems necessary at a much-reduced cost to them so as to gain or maintain a stronghold in any particular industry. Therefore, I am heartened that the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary through his graciousness saw me today, expressed a willingness to work with the small inventor to make sure that the small inventor was protected and the fact that he is open to holding a hearing on this issue.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO), the chairman of the Committee on Small Business. I want him to know how much I appreciate knowing of his concerns regarding the important role of our country's patent system, and I am prepared to work with him on this subject. In fact, I share his appreciation of the entrepreneurial spirit of America, whereby inventors apply their creativity and ingenuity to technology every day in this country.

I want to reassure the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO) that since this issue is squarely in the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, it will fully get the proper attention it deserves.

The bill we consider today, H.R. 1886, will not prejudice inventors, small businesses or anyone else connected with inventive activity. In fact, it will help level the playing field in this area regarding the patent code procedures. This will help us achieve our goals beyond patent reexamination, which include giving investors confidence in a patented invention so that doubts can be cast aside and that capital may be raised to help in the financing of entrepreneurial concern.

Second, this bill does not create new tools for litigation to harass or abuse inventors. In the past I have opposed such legislation and will continue to do so in the future.

Finally, I appreciate the concerns that the gentleman has raised. The Subcommittee on Courts, the Internet and Intellectual Property held two hearings on this subject earlier this year. In an effort to continue exploring this vital subject, I am directing my staff to schedule a third hearing on this subject and other issues of importance to inventors.

I thank the gentleman and look forward to working with him on his issue.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1886.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REQUIRING A REPORT ON THE OPERATIONS OF THE STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2048) to require a report on the operations of the State Justice Institute.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2048

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

SECTION 1. REPORT BY ATTORNEY GENERAL ON STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE.

Section 213 of the State Justice Institute Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10712) is amended by striking "On October 1, 1987" and inserting "Not later than October 1, 2002".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 2048, the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 2408 will require the Attorney General to submit a report to the House and Senate Committees on the Judiciary regarding the effectiveness of the State Justice Institute. This report would be due by October 1, 2002.

Congress established SJI as a private, nonprofit corporation in 1984. Its stated purpose is to further the development and adoption of improved judicial administration in State courts. SJI is to accomplish this goal by providing funds to State courts and other national organizations or nonprofit organizations which support the State courts. SJI also fosters coordination and cooperation with the Federal judiciary in areas of mutual concern.

Since becoming operational in 1987, the institute has awarded more than \$125 million in grants to support over 1,000 projects; another \$40 million in matching requirements has been gen-

erated from other public and private funding sources. As noted, H.R. 2048 would require the Attorney General to study the operations of the institute and release a report on its effectiveness. After 14 years and \$165 million in grants, it is now more appropriate to take a closer look at the efficiency and effectiveness of this institute and the project it supports.

Madam Speaker, this concludes my description of the bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time I may consume. (Mr. BERMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2048. This bill was marked up and favorably reported by voice vote by the Committee on the Judiciary on July 24. It is wholly non-controversial.

It requires the Attorney General in consultation with the State Justice Institute to submit a report to the House and Senate Committees on the Judiciary regarding the effectiveness of the institute. The report will be due no later than October 1, 2002.

The SJI is a useful project. Congress created it in 1984 to provide funds to improve the quality of justice in State courts. Congress also directed the SJI to facilitate enhanced coordination between State and Federal courts and develop solutions to common problems faced by all courts. It was last reauthorized in 1992. That expired in fiscal year 1996.

While the Committee on Appropriations has continued to appropriate approximately \$7 million annually for the State Justice Institute, it has not been formally reauthorized since 1996 by the authorizing committee of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The ultimate purpose of the SJI report mandated by this legislation is to aid Congress in reauthorizing the SJI. With the information from this report, Congress can ensure that SJI reauthorization is accomplished with all due diligence.

The Attorney General did issue a study of its effectiveness in 1987, but this report provides little information, as the SJI did not become operational until 1987. So we need a new report to help inform future legislation to reauthorize it.

H.R. 2048 is a good bill, and I ask my colleagues to support it.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE).

Mr. COBLE. Madam Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) pretty well laid this out.

I would just indicate that by noting that the 1984 legislation which created

the institute required the Attorney General to submit a report governing the effectiveness of the State Justice Institute's operations by October 1, 1987, to the House and Senate Committees on the Judiciary. Since SJI did not become operational until fiscal year 1987, the report submitted by former Attorney General Meese is of limited value in assessing the operations of the institute.

H.R. 2048 simply changes the due date for a report that will be identical in scope to the 1987 study. Unlike the previous effort, however, the study that will emanate from H.R. 2048 will be based on at least 14 years' worth of operations at the institute. As a result, Congress should have the first real comprehensive evaluation of the effectiveness of SJI by October 1, 2002.

Madam Speaker, this is a non-controversial bill, as has been indicated. It promotes good government. While I am impressed with SJI operations to date, all Federal entities should be accountable to the taxpayers. I therefore urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2048.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANT RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

Mr. HYDE. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 233) recognizing the important relationship between the United States and Mexico.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 233

Whereas the United States and Mexico share a special bilateral friendship which is matched by few other countries in the world;

Whereas the United States and Mexico are partners joined by geography as well as by a multitude of government-to-government and private relationships which are of critical importance to both countries;

Whereas the United States and Mexico share concerns on a wide range of issues, including trade, immigration, the environment, economic development, and regional security and stability;

Whereas Vicente Fox Quesada of the Alliance for Change (consisting of the National Action Party and the Mexican Green Party) was sworn in as President of the United Mexican States on December 1, 2000, the first opposition candidate to be elected president in Mexico in seven decades;

Whereas the United States, as Mexico's neighbor, ally, and partner in the hemi-

sphere, has a strong interest in President Fox's success in promoting prosperity and democracy in his country and the region during his term of office; and

Whereas President Vicente Fox is making a state visit to Washington, D.C. on September 5-7, 2001: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) welcomes the state visit by the President of the United Mexican States, Vicente Fox Quesada; and

(2) declares that, in keeping with the just interests of the United States, the special nature of the relationship between the United States and Mexico should be further cultivated to the mutual benefit of both countries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HYDE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HYDE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, just over 1 year ago, on July 2, 2000, an extraordinary event took place. In a single day the people of Mexico peacefully ended 7 decades of one-party rule with their votes. Tomorrow, the man they elected as their president, Vicente Fox, will address a joint meeting of Congress as part of the first State visit hosted by George W. Bush.

The inauguration of Vicente Fox as Mexico's president has ushered in a new chapter in our Nation's relationship with our neighbor to the south. President Bush and President Fox have seized the opportunity to forge a new partnership. Both leaders have acted to leave the past and build a road to the future based on real shared interests.

The cornerstone of our relationship with Mexico is the North America Free Trade Agreement, initiated under the President's father's administration.

Commerce between the United States and Mexico increased from \$83 billion in 1994 to nearly \$200 billion in 1999. Total trade among the three NAFTA members, including Canada, reached \$557 billion in 1999. Mexico has surpassed Japan as the United States's second largest trading partner. Even so, there is a belief abroad in our land that NAFTA is the culprit for the present economic downturn. This is simply not true.

The implementation of NAFTA, in fact, coincided with the longest peacetime economic expansion in the history of our Nation.

The trafficking of illicit narcotics through Mexico has left a swath of cor-

ruption and misery in its path. Securing Mexico's full cooperation in addressing the drug threat has long bedeviled our relations. President Fox has, however, demonstrated great courage in facing this violent and corrosive threat to the security of both of our nations. Under his leadership, Mexico has finally begun to extradite Mexican drug kingpins to face justice in the United States for their crimes.

Under President Fox's leadership, real law enforcement cooperation has begun at the working level where it counts, policeman to policeman.

Migration is at the top of our bilateral agenda with Mexico. The U.S. Census of 2000 revealed that almost 12 percent of the U.S. population is of Hispanic origin. Mexicans and Mexican-Americans constitute about 65 percent of that total. President Bush believes it is very important that America be a Nation that welcomes immigrants. He recognizes the huge contributions to our economy that immigrant workers, including Mexicans, have made and the vital role America has in welcoming people who will fulfill that role in our economy.

□ 1615

Accordingly, President Bush and President Fox have been working to establish a series of principles regarding migration issues that will be announced during President Fox's state visit.

Madam Speaker, the resolution before the House today recognizes the extraordinarily important bilateral relationship between the United States and Mexico, and welcomes the state visit by Mexico's democratically elected leader, President Vicente Fox.

Madam Speaker, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL), introduced a similar resolution earlier this year, and I am pleased he is among the Members from both parties, including the ranking member of our Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), who have cosponsored this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Madam Speaker, I certainly commend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the chairman of the Committee on International Relations, for his leadership and for his sponsorship of this resolution, House Resolution 233, and I endorse the resolution, and also recognize the support of the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the ranking Democratic member of the Committee on International Relations.

I also acknowledge the support of the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALENGER),