

That would be in the interest of the American people.

I feel privileged to be a part of the Subcommittee's efforts. I want to thank you for allowing me to testify here before you today and I will now be glad to answer any questions.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell my colleagues what he said. He is a gentleman who has worked for 30 years on obesity in this country, and he said, "Through working with obese patients, I have learned that the worst thing one can do is to blame an outside force to get themselves 'off the hook,' to say it's not their fault, and that they are a victim. Congress has rightly recognized the danger of allowing Americans to continue blaming others for the obesity epidemic. It is imperative that we prevent lawsuits from being filed against any industry for answering consumer demands. The fact that we are addressing the issue here today is a step in the right direction."

Mr. Speaker, I will tell my colleagues that the Republican House and the Republican Senate are addressing the issues. We are doing those things that not only Members find of interest to people back home, but also in the interest of what is the right thing for America to do.

I feel like what we are doing today is right in line with what all 50 States have and that is a law that says we will not take these fast food restaurants to task, to go and have a lawsuit against them, and the Federal Government, we, as members of Congress, are going to affirm that, to avoid a problem before it becomes one. We have been warned about the problems. We are trying to do aggressive things and the right thing for it.

I support this rule. I support this underlying legislation, and I think that it will win overwhelmingly because this is the best answer.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we are fat. America is the fattest nation on the planet and getting fatter all the time. It is estimated that as many as one in five Americans is obese, a condition defined as being more than 30 percent above the ideal weight based on height.

Being overweight and obese in the United States occurs at higher rates in racial and ethnic minority populations, such as African Americans and Hispanic Americans, compared with White Americans. Persons of low socioeconomic status within minority populations appear to be particularly affected by being overweight and obese. Also, according to the surgeon general, women of lower socioeconomic status are about 50 percent more likely to be obese than their better-off counterparts.

Obesity is fast becoming our most serious public health problem. Indeed, obesity is linked to disease such as type-2 diabetes, heart disease and certain types of cancer. An estimated 300,000 Americans die each year from fat-related causes, and we spent \$117 billion in obesity-related economic costs just last year, according to U.S. Surgeon General David Satcher.

Congress should consider comprehensive legislation aimed at America's obesity epi-

demic. Instead, Mr. Speaker, here I stand debating a closed rule for a bill that pre-determines that in no plausible circumstance do food companies bear responsibility for their acts.

This bill is so overbroad that it provides immunity even where most would think liability is appropriate.

For instance, as an observant Hindu, Mr. Sharma considers cows sacred. Not surprisingly, Brij Sharma did not eat at fast food restaurants. But in 1990, when McDonald's announced that it was switching from beef fat to "100 percent vegetable oil" to cook its French fries, Mr. Sharma began going to the fast food chain to eat what he believed were vegetarian fries.

Imagine Mr. Sharma's terror when he read in a newspaper the following heading, "Where's the beef? It's in your french fries." He was outraged to learn that McDonald's french fries are seasoned in the factory with beef flavoring before they are sent to the restaurants to be cooked in vegetable oil.

McDonald's has apologized, admitted wrongdoing and agreed to pay more than \$10 million to charities chosen by vegetarian and Hindus plaintiffs. Is it not preposterous that this bill would bail out the fast food industry from liability for wrongdoing such as this? Of course it is.

In addition, this bill is an unnecessary, premature, overly broad affront to our judicial system and to our system of federalism. Congress is preemptively taking away the ability of judges and jurors to consider the particular facts and evidence of cases, and a plaintiff's ability to have his or her day in court.

Mr. Speaker, regardless of one's position on the merits of lawsuits against the industry, the line drawn between the responsibility of an individual end and society's start should be answered by judges and juries, and not by legislators in the pockets of campaign contributors.

This incredibly large portion of legislative junk food, being served to feed Republican special interests, is as unhealthy as the industry it attempts to protect.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this ill-conceived legislation.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REHBERG). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

RECORD votes on postponed questions will be taken later today.

#### STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2004

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and

pass the bill (H.R. 2714) to reauthorize the State Justice Institute, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2714

*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 "State Justice Institute Reauthorization Act of 2004".

#### SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 215 of the State Justice Institute Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10713) is amended to read as follows:

##### "AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 215. There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the purposes of this title, \$7,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2005, 2006, 2007, and 2008. Amounts appropriated for each such year are to remain available until expended."

#### SEC. 3. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) STATUS OF INSTITUTE.—Section 205(c) of the State Justice Institute Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10704(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(3) The Institute may purchase goods and services from the General Services Administration in order to carry out its functions."

(b) STATUS AS OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES.—Section 205(d)(2) of the State Justice Institute Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10704(d)(2)) is amended by inserting ", notwithstanding section 8914 of such title" after "(relating to health insurance)".

(c) MEETINGS.—Section 204(j) of the State Justice Institute Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10703(j)) is amended by inserting "(on any occasion on which that committee has been delegated the authority to act on behalf of the Board)" after "executive committee of the Board".

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).

□ 1200

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2714, the bill currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, Congress established the State Justice Institute as a private nonprofit corporation in 1984. Its purpose is to improve judicial administration in the State courts. SJI accomplishes this goal by providing funds to State courts and to other national organizations or nonprofits that support State courts. SJI also fosters cooperation with the Federal judiciary in areas of mutual concern.

Pursuant to oversight legislation passed in the previous Congress, the

Attorney General, in consultation with the Federal Judicial Center, conducted review of the SJI operations and reported its findings to Congress late last year. The results are encouraging. The Attorney General noted that the Institute has been effective and has complied with its statutory mission, and observed that support for State court innovation and improvement is a Federal interest.

Mr. Speaker, based upon the beneficial work SJI has done, I believe it should be afforded a congressional reauthorization, and that is the purpose of this bill. More specifically, section 2 of the bill authorizes \$7 million annually for SJI operations over a 4-year cycle. Appropriated funds under section 2 are to remain available until expended. The last two bills reauthorizing the Institute contain such language which reflects the reality that no grant agency can fully expend all of its funds in the year of appropriation.

In addition, section 3 of the bill authorized the Institute to purchase goods and services from the General Services Administration. Because SJI is not a Federal agency, it is not legally authorized to procure goods and services from the GSA. In some instances, this exclusion can create unnecessary hardship. To illustrate, SJI was recently denied the ability to purchase GSA storage boxes to transfer its records to the National Archives.

Mr. Speaker, in sum, the bill represents a modest authorization for a small but important organization that assists our State court systems. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2714, the State Justice Institute Reauthorization Act. As the title indicates, H.R. 2714 reauthorizes the State Justice Institute, SJI. Reauthorization is necessary because Congress last enacted an SJI authorization bill in 1992 for a 4-year authorization period that expired in fiscal year 1996. While the Committee on Appropriations has continued to appropriate \$7 million annually for SJI, Congress should also ensure that SJI has the necessary authorization to perform its important work.

Congress created the SJI 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 appears that the SJI has made considerable progress in pursuit of these objectives.

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 generated from other public and private funding sources. SJI is necessary because State court judges and other ad-

vocates have historically been weak at restoring resources, especially at the Federal level, from the Department of Justice. Most of the resources they receive at the State level are devoted for personnel and courthouse construction and maintenance, not the educational programs that SJI provides. About one-third of all SJI grants are devoted to educating State judges on how to improve the operations of their courts. The remaining grants are devoted to technology projects such as systems to improve recordkeeping, document imaging, et cetera.

The authorizing statute provides for regular audits of the SJI. The Institute conducts its own oversight of grantees, and the practice of allowing a grantee to draw money for a project only on a monthly or quarterly basis allows SJI to cancel mismanaged projects.

All familiar with the SJI appear to agree it performs worthy work. Federal judges, including Chief Judge Boggs of the 6th Circuit, have contacted me to laud the work of the SJI, and in particular, the educational programs it runs for judges.

The Attorney General gave high marks to the SJI in a November 2002 report which specifically noted that the Institute has been effective, has complied with its statutory mission, and observes that some degree of support for State court innovation and improvement is a Federal interest. It is evident that the SJI deserves reauthorization, H.R. 2714 will do this. I urge my colleagues to support it today.

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will reauthorize the State Justice Institute, which is a nonprofit corporation created in 1994 to provide grants and other funding to help State courts improve their systems.

According to the Institute's mission statement, "Since becoming operational in 1987, SJI has awarded over \$120 million to support more than 1,000 projects benefiting the Nation's judicial system and the public it serves. The Institute is unique both in its mission and how it seeks to fulfill it."

The SJI provides funding for programs which help improve access to the courts. It trains and assists courts in child custody, domestic violence, juvenile crime, and sexual assault cases. The SJI also works to create the use of technology in the courtroom, as well as create reforms to reduce the amount of time and money associated with litigation.

By reauthorizing the State Justice Institute, we will provide them with \$7 million each year for the next 4 years. This money helps Americans have access to a more effective and efficient court system. The State Justice Insti-

tute has been successful in its efforts. We should make sure they are able to continue their good work, and this bill will do just that. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2714, the State Justice Institute Reauthorization Act—legislation to reauthorize appropriations for the State Justice Institute through FY 2008.

Founded by Congress more than a decade ago, the State Justice Institute (SJI) was established to support efforts to improve the quality of justice in State courts, facilitate better coordination between State and Federal courts, and foster innovative, efficient solutions to common problems faced by all courts. About one-third of all SJI grants are devoted to educating state judges on how to improve the operations of their courts. The remaining grants are devoted to technology projects such as efforts to improve recordkeeping.

The Chief Justice of the California Supreme Court, Ronald M. George, has relayed to me the important work done by the State Justice Institute, and I know his views are shared by a great many of the nation's top judges. In a 2002 report, the Attorney General of the United States also noted that the Institute has been effective and has complied with its statutory mission. In addition, he observed that support for state court innovation and improvement is a federal interest.

As a Co-Chair of the bipartisan Congressional Caucus on the Judicial Branch, I recognize the importance of working in Congress to ensure that we maintain a strong and vibrant court system in our country.

The last time that Congress reauthorized the State Justice Institute was in 1992. In the interim, the Appropriations Committee has continued to fund the important work of the Institute, and I have urged appropriators to support such funding to allow the Institute to continue its fine work. It is now time for Congress to act and to reauthorize this important program that will continue to improve the administration of justice in our courts.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2714, the State Justice Institute Reauthorization Act of 2003. I worked with my colleagues on the House Judiciary committee to mark this bill up in September of last year, and I offered my support at that time. This bill will authorize the operations of the State Justice Institute (SJI) for Fiscal Years 2005–08 and proposes to allocate grant money to state courts and other entities that support their operation. I understand that this bill has not been reauthorized since 1996, so this bill is indeed timely, as the need certainly does exist.

Since its inception in 1984 and operation in 1987, the SJI's \$125 million in grants and \$40 million in private and other public funds have played a role in making the state court system in Houston an efficient engine of the administration of justice of which we Houstonians are quite proud. Given the urgent need for us to allocate energy and resources to our critical infrastructure and to the first responders in the context of Homeland security, the insurgence of funds to improve the overall flow of work through the state court systems is extremely important. For example, during the recent blackouts, those agencies and offices that needed this kind of assistance the most had to suffer until power was restored. In some instances, the blackouts were crippling. If there

had been a real threat of terror in those instances, the areas of vulnerability would have translated to disaster. This area of the assessment of threat and vulnerability will be best served by the provision that requires the Attorney General, in consultation with the Federal Judicial Center, to submit a report to the House and Senate Committees on the Judiciary as to the success and effectiveness of the SJI.

Furthermore, the authorization of the Institute to procure goods and services from the General Services Administration (GSA) will be a boon to those administrative areas that are antiquated and non-functioning for want of new equipment and resources. Should this bill pass, I would look forward to conducting a full assessment of need in Houston and make these GSA resources available as soon as possible.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, for the above reasons, I support H.R. 2714 and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. 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. 2714, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### COOPERATIVE RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY ENHANCEMENT (CREATE) ACT OF 2004

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2391) to amend title 35, United States Code, to promote research among universities, the public sector, and private enterprise, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2391

*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 "Cooperative Research and Technology Enhancement (CREATE) Act of 2004".*

#### SEC. 2. COLLABORATIVE EFFORTS ON CLAIMED INVENTIONS.

*Section 103(c) of title 35, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:*

*"(c)(1) Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under one or more of subsections (e), (f), and (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the claimed invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.*

*"(2) For purposes of this subsection, subject matter developed by another person and a claimed invention shall be deemed to have been owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person if—*

*"(A) the claimed invention was made by or on behalf of parties to a joint research agreement that was in effect on or before the date the claimed invention was made;*

*"(B) the claimed invention was made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of the joint research agreement; and*

*"(C) the application for patent for the claimed invention discloses or is amended to disclose the names of the parties to the joint research agreement.*

*"(3) For purposes of paragraph (2), the term 'joint research agreement' means a written contract, grant, or cooperative agreement entered into by two or more persons or entities for the performance of experimental, developmental, or research work in the field of the claimed invention."*

#### SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

*(a) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this Act shall apply to any patent granted on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.*

*(b) SPECIAL RULE.—The amendments made by this Act shall not affect any final decision of a court or the United States Patent and Trademark Office rendered before the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall not affect the right of any party in any action pending before the United States Patent and Trademark Office or a court on the date of the enactment of this Act to have that party's rights determined on the basis of the provisions of title 35, United States Code, in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act.*

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. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2391, the bill currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2391 will help spur the development of new technologies by making it easier for collaborative inventors who represent more than one organization to obtain the protection of the U.S. patent system for their inventions.

The bill achieves this goal by limiting the circumstances in which confidential information which is voluntarily exchanged by individual research team members may be asserted to bar the patenting of the team's new inventions.

Today, intellectual property-reliant industries, such as pharmaceuticals, biotechnology and nanotechnology, serve as key catalysts to the U.S. economy, employing tens of thousands of Americans. More often than not, the innovations they develop are not done solely by researchers in-house, but rather, in concert with other researchers who may be located at universities, nonprofit institutions, and other private enterprises.

Carl E. Gulbrandsen, the managing director of the Wisconsin Research Alumni Research Foundation, provided

an assessment of the value of university research contributions when he testified before the Subcommittee on Intellectual Property last Congress that, "In 2000, nonprofits and universities spent a record of \$28.1 billion on research and development, much of which involved collaborations among private, public, and nonprofit entities."

Sales of products developed from inventions transferred from those research centers resulted in revenues that approached \$42 billion that year, a portion of which was then reinvested into additional research. As significant as this research activity is, the tangible benefits of its application are also worth noting. Inventions such as the MRI and the sequencing of human genome technology were both made possible through collaborative research.

In 1984, Congress acted to incentivize innovation by encouraging researchers within organizations to share information. That year, Congress amended the patent law to restrict the use of background scientific or technical information shared among researchers in an effort to deny a patent in instances where the subject matter and the claimed invention were under common ownership or control.

This bill will provide a similar statutory "safe harbor" for inventions that result from collaborative activities of private, public and nonprofit entities. In doing so, the bill responds to the 1997 *OddzON Products, Inc. v. Just Toys, Inc.*, decision of the Federal Circuit Court of Appeals by clarifying that prior inventions of team members will not serve as an absolute bar of the patenting of the team's new invention when the parties conduct themselves in accordance with the terms of the bill.

In the future, research collaborations between academia and industry will be even more critical to the efforts of U.S. industry to maintain our technological preeminence. By enacting this bill, Congress will help foster improved communication between researchers, provide additional certainty and structure for those who engage in collaborative research, reduce patent litigation incentives, and facilitate innovation and investment.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the Judiciary unanimously approved H.R. 2391 on January 21, 2004. I understand that the Congressional Budget Office considers the bill to have an insignificant effect on the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office's spending, and has found that the bill contains no inter-governmental or private sector mandates.

The bill itself is a product of the collaborative efforts of a number of individuals and leading professional patent and research organizations. Among those who contributed substantially to the development of the bill are the USPTO, the Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation, the American Council on Education, the American University Technology Managers, the Biotechnology Industry Organization,