

time. For example, Mr. Speaker, I personally renew my call to our colleagues to put an end to the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq which no longer can be justified in terms of national security, and which together costs us well over \$100 billion dollars a year, as part of a package of steps that will bring down our annual deficits.

[From the Herald News, July 13, 2011]

CHAMBER URGES CONGRESS TO RAISE DEBT LIMIT

(By Jason Rua and Robert A. Mellion)

The Fall River Area Chamber of Commerce and Industry represents a broad range of businesses in the South Coast region of Massachusetts.

Our membership employs tens of thousands of people comprising all sectors of the economy including education and high tech to healthcare, tourism and hospitality, manufacturing, service and small businesses. They are also the individuals who are making the local investments, taking risks, creating jobs and through their taxes and payrolls, providing the means for the community to afford the public amenities we all enjoy.

That is why the chamber, on behalf of its diverse and vested membership, respectfully urges Congress to place the nation ahead of party politics by raising the federal debt limit without delay. Failure to increase the statutory debt limit in a timely fashion can have a significant and long-lasting negative impact on any potential recovery in the towns and cities of the South Coast. For that reason we urge the Massachusetts congressional delegation to act prudently by representing the best interests of your constituency.

Raising the statutory debt limit is critical to ensuring global confidence in the creditworthiness of the United States. Not acting decisively on this issue will raise national interest rates and inevitably the ability of businesses to secure financing.

With economic growth in the commonwealth of Massachusetts slowly picking up for the first time in three years, we cannot afford to jeopardize a few steps forward with the threat of a massive spike in borrowing costs that would result if our country defaulted on its international obligations. To the contrary, it is practical economic theory that the United States stands fully behind its legal obligations.

In making such recommendations, business leaders in the SouthCoast also remain extremely concerned about the level of the federal debt and the unchecked annual budget deficits that have become the new normal in Washington D.C. Balance to our fiscal position is critical for national economic sustainability and tough decisions on federal spending must be made as part of a long term debate about the future of this nation. Quite simply, the U.S. government must learn to spend more wisely.

The chamber trusts that under the continued leadership offered by the bipartisan Massachusetts congressional delegation, Congress will again take the necessary steps to preserve our nation's financial standing in the world. Such stewardship is required in this 11th hour. Please ensure that the national and Massachusetts economies continue on a path toward restored prosperity. Raise the federal debt ceiling and set in motion a dialogue to curb unchecked federal spending.

RECOGNIZING THE 37TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TURKISH INVASION OF CYPRUS

HON. LOIS CAPPs

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2011

Mrs. CAPPs. Mr. Speaker, on July 20, we mark the 37th anniversary of the Turkish invasion and subsequent occupation of Cyprus.

Cyprus has a rich culture and religious history. However, its history has been difficult due to myriad conflicts with its neighbor Turkey, including the occupation, which continues to this day on over a third of the Island.

I want to express my concern about violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms of the Cypriot people. Moreover, reports of the segregation of Greek and Turkish Cypriot people are equally troubling. Any means of violence has simply exacerbated conflicts between the Cypriot and Turkish people, and cannot be an option moving forward.

Cyprus and the U.S. share a deep and abiding commitment to upholding the ideals of freedom, democracy, justice, human rights, and the international rule of law. Infringements upon these American—and Cypriot—principles should not go unnoticed. I remain steadfast in my dedication to correcting these problems and working with others to ensure that Cyprus can flourish for years to come.

Thirty-seven years later, I remain committed to the goal of a reunified and prosperous Cyprus where Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots can live together in peace and security.

INTRODUCTION OF THE INNOVATIVE DESIGN PROTECTION AND PIRACY PREVENTION ACT

HON. BOB GOODLATTE

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2011

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, Article I, section 8, of the Constitution lays the framework for our nation's copyright laws. It grants Congress the power to award inventors and creators for limited amounts of time exclusive rights to their inventions and works. The Founding Fathers realized that such an incentive was crucial to ensure that America would become the world's leader in innovation and creativity. This incentive is still necessary to maintain America's position as the world leader in innovation.

Most industrialized nations provide legal protection for fashion designs. However, in the United States, the world's leader in innovation and creativity, fashion designs are not protected by traditional intellectual property regimes. Copyrights are not granted to apparel because articles of clothing, which are both creative and functional, are considered useful articles, as opposed to works of art. Design patents are intended to protect ornamental designs, but clothing rarely meets the criteria of patentability. Trademarks only protect brand names and logos, not the clothing itself. And the Supreme Court has refused to extend trade dress protection to apparel designs. Thus, a thief violates Federal law when he steals a creator's design, reproduces and sells

that article of clothing, and attaches a fake label to the garment for marketing purposes.

But it is perfectly legal for that same thief to steal the design, reproduce the article of clothing, and sell it, provided he does not attach a fake label to the finished product. This loophole allows pirates to cash in on the sweat equity of others and prevents designers in our country from reaping a fair return on their creative investments.

The production lifecycle for fashion designs is very short. Once a design achieves popularity through a fashion show or other event, a designer usually has a limited number of months to produce and market that original design. Further complicating this short-term cycle is the reality that once a design is made public, pirates can immediately offer identical knockoffs on the Internet for distribution.

Again, under current law, this theft is legal unless the thief reproduces a label or trademark. And because these knockoffs are usually of such poor quality, they damage the designer's reputation as well. Common sense dictates that we should inhibit this activity by protecting original fashion works.

Our undertaking is similar to action taken by Congress in 1998 when we wrote Chapter 13 of the Copyright Act, which offers protection for vessel hull designs. The "Innovative Design Protection and Piracy Prevention Act" amends this statutory template to include protections for fashion designs. Because the production lifecycle for fashion designs is very short, this legislation similarly provides a shorter period of protection of 3 years that suits the industry.

The bill enjoys support among those in the fashion and apparel industries. While concerns have been expressed about the scope of previous versions of this legislation, my office has engaged in discussions through the years with interested parties to ensure that the bill does not prohibit designs that are simply inspired by other designs; rather, the legislation only targets those designs that are "substantially identical" to a protected design. Other provisions, including a "home-sewing" exception and a requirement that a designer alleging infringement plead with particularity, ensure that the bill does not encourage harassing or litigious behavior.

I urge the Members of the House to support this legislation, which will grant to American creators similar protections that those in most other industrialized countries enjoy.

H. RES. 268—U.S. SUPPORT FOR A NEGOTIATED SOLUTION TO THE ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN CONFLICT

HON. STEVE ISRAEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2011

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a cosponsor of H. Res. 268. This resolution reaffirms the United States' support for a negotiated solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

For those who say the path to peace in the Middle East is easy, let them consider the path I recently had to take just to fly to Israel. In May, I traveled with other members of this body on a bipartisan Congressional delegation to the Middle East. Our trip was scheduled to

take us from the Al Udeid Air Base in Qatar, across Kuwait and Iraq and into Israel. However, before our plane was able to take off the Kuwaitis denied us overflight rights because our destination was Israel. After lengthy negotiations, our pilots were given permission to fly over Kuwaiti airspace, but as our plane neared the Iraqi border the government of Iraq denied our request to enter their airspace, again because our destination was Israel. We were forced to circle for 90 minutes while we once again negotiated with a government for whom the United States has spilled both blood and treasure. Finally, the Iraqis gave us permission to fly over their country only if we agreed to land in Jordan before flying on to Israel. Our plane landed in Amman, taxied to the end of the runway, and then took off for a seven minute flight to Israel. Apparently, American service members can die in Iraq, American taxpayer dollars can be spent on Iraq, but an American Congressional delegation on a U.S. military aircraft cannot fly over Iraq en route to Israel. So, when Israel's neighbors demand that Israel make difficult concessions as a precursor to peace negotiations, we should keep in mind the behavior of these neighbors and their refusal to accept Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state.

Now the Palestinians are threatening to seek a unilateral declaration of statehood through the United Nations. President Obama has already stated that the United States will veto any unilateral declaration at the UN, so the Palestinians' continued push for a UN vote in September is nothing but an attempt to delegitimize the state of Israel. Today, the House of Representatives can reinforce our nation's support for Israel and support for a negotiated peace.

Israel has shown it is ready to take risks for peace. If the Palestinians want a state that is formally recognized by the international community they should sit down with the Israelis and negotiate.

H. RES. 268

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2011

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I emphatically agree that a negotiated settlement to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is the only viable path forward for the parties and for those in the international community and region who seek peace and stability in this contentious area of our world.

I want to be clear: unilateral actions by the Palestinians or Israelis, including seeking recognition at the U.N., are not helpful to the peace process. It seems to me that there have not been many successful unilateral acts undertaken in this region that have resulted in more peace and less violence. Why would anyone want to go down that road again?

Limiting this resolution to the sentiment expressed in bullet number one of the resolution that reaffirms Congress' "strong support for a negotiated solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict resulting in two states, a democratic, Jewish state of Israel and a viable, democratic Palestinian state, living side-by-side in peace, security, and mutual recognition" would have won my enthusiastic and full-hearted support.

It was the presence of this language that kept me from voting no on this resolution. I

again reiterate my condemnation of this House continuing to bring resolutions that only seem to relitigate every wrong committed by one party to this conflict. Whatever happened to the grandiose ideal that the United States of America would be an "honest broker" in this process?

The fact is that both Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas and Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu have tough choices ahead of them that will affect the pursuit of peace in the Middle East. As I stated in a letter to President Obama last year in support of strong U.S. engagement in renewed Middle East Peace talks, allowing actions by either party that undermine the process to go unchallenged serves to fan animosity and mistrust, which feeds a cycle of conflict and violence. This neither serves the interests of the U.S., our ally Israel, nor the Palestinians.

We must avoid ending up in a situation like Canada reportedly faced last year when it cut funding for activities of the U.N. Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees only to have the government of Israel, among others, push for a reversal of that decision. It's an example of an action that looks "pro-Israel" on the politics, but failed the more important test of whether it actually advanced or hindered the interests of our allies in the region.

The Palestinian people don't want symbolic statehood, they want an actual state with borders and the ability to enjoy a livelihood in peace and security. The same for the Israeli people. They want real security and real peace. Both peoples would gladly trade resolutions from the U.S. Congress for real progress on the ground.