

THE MARRIAGE TAX PENALTY MAKES NO SENSE

(Mr. BRADY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRADY. Mr. Speaker, a lot of Americans look at our government and conclude that many of the things it does simply make no sense. The marriage tax penalty certainly falls into that category.

The Federal Government has actually set up the system that taxes people more to marry than for couples who live together.

When people shake their heads about the latest crazy scheme to come out of Washington, this is exactly the kind of thing they have in mind. There is no telling what social engineers were thinking when they created this marriage tax, but Americans with common sense think it is time to change, it is time to get rid of the idea of taxing people more to marry than those who live together.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to support H.R. 3734, the Weller-McIntosh bill to eliminate the marriage tax penalty, because it just makes sense.

SUPPORT H.R. 3734 AND ELIMINATE THE MARRIAGE TAX PENALTY

(Mr. EWING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party, I think, has shown that they stand for tax relief and tax cuts. We stand for across-the-board tax relief for middle-class Americans. We would like to see the capital gains tax eliminated completely. We would like to see the IRA accounts expanded. We stand for eliminating estate taxes. We want a fair tax system that allows us to fund government at a reasonable level and yet allow Americans to keep more of what they earn.

Now we cannot do all of that at once, but what we can do right now is eliminate the marriage tax penalty from the Tax Code. H.R. 3734 will eliminate the marriage tax penalty and would be an excellent first step in achieving our goals.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a Member of the Committee on Science:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 30, 1998.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, The
U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: After much thought and consideration, I am tendering my resignation from the Science Committee on which it has been a privilege to serve. As I complete my duties this year, I am nec-

essarily turning my attention to numerous projects that must be completed before the end of my term.

Sincerely,

PAUL MCHALE,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

SALUTING THE DISTINGUISHED CAREER OF BOB LENT OF THE UNITED AUTO WORKERS

(Mr. BONIOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Bob Lent of the United Auto Workers, who is retiring after a long and distinguished career serving his country, his union, and his community. I mention these together because they cannot be separated. Bob's personal investment in time and his sweat and loyalty and pride to build a stronger union, to build a stronger community, to build a stronger Nation, reflects the democratic values that I think we all share.

Many people know Bob as the president of UAW Region 1, which includes about 100,000 working men and women in southeastern Michigan and Ontario, but that is only the latest form of his service. As a young man he served as an army paratrooper; later, while working full time, raising a family, and doing union work, Bob volunteered on local political campaigns. He joined the NAACP and became a board member for area charities. His generosity and leadership have made a big difference in our community.

Underlying all of these commitments was Bob's belief in his capacity to contribute to the greater good. It is no understatement to say that for almost half a century Bob has helped to put the small "d" into American democracy.

So, Mr. Speaker, today I salute Bob and thank his wife, Earline, for years of friendship, leadership and community service. Congratulations, Bob.

ELIMINATE THE MARRIAGE PENALTY IN OUR TAX CODE

(Mr. MCINTOSH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the marriage penalty elimination bill, H.R. 3734, the Weller-McIntosh bill that will eliminate the marriage penalty in our Tax Code. There are so many reasons why we should eliminate this unfair and immoral tax provision. But I wanted to share with my colleagues an e-mail that I received the other day from a young man who said: Before we set a wedding date, I calculated the tax implications. Since we each earn in the low \$30,000, the Federal marriage penalty was over \$3,000. What a wonderful wedding gift from the IRS.

Or another e-mail from Wayne in Dayton, Ohio, who says that penalizing for marriage flies in the face of common sense. It is a classic example of government policy not supporting that which it wishes to promote.

These e-mails have been coming by the thousands into our office, and I ask any of those out there who are watching to communicate with me their family situation about the problems with this marriage penalty tax. We are making great progress in Washington, but we need support from the American people to eliminate this tax in our budget in the House, and next fall in our tax bill. It will save Americans \$1,400 on their tax bill per family.

□ 1415

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NETHERCUTT). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion 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 4 of rule XV.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules, but not before 5 p.m. today.

MADRID PROTOCOL IMPLEMENTATION ACT

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 567) to amend the Trademark Act of 1946 to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, in order to carry out provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 567

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 "Madrid Protocol Implementation Act".

SEC. 2. PROVISIONS TO IMPLEMENT THE PROTOCOL RELATING TO THE MADRID AGREEMENT CONCERNING THE INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION OF MARKS.

The Act entitled "An Act to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes", approved July 5, 1946, as amended (15 U.S.C. 1051 and following) (commonly referred to as the "Trademark Act of 1946") is amended by adding after section 51 the following new title:

"TITLE XII—THE MADRID PROTOCOL

"SEC. 60. DEFINITIONS.

"For purposes of this title:

"(1) MADRID PROTOCOL.—The term 'Madrid Protocol' means the Protocol Relating to the Madrid Agreement Concerning the International Registration of Marks, adopted at Madrid, Spain, on June 27, 1989.

"(2) BASIC APPLICATION.—The term 'basic application' means the application for the

registration of a mark that has been filed with an Office of a Contracting Party and that constitutes the basis for an application for the international registration of that mark.

“(3) BASIC REGISTRATION.—The term ‘basic registration’ means the registration of a mark that has been granted by an Office of a Contracting Party and that constitutes the basis for an application for the international registration of that mark.

“(4) CONTRACTING PARTY.—The term ‘Contracting Party’ means any country or intergovernmental organization that is a party to the Madrid Protocol.

“(5) DATE OF RECORDAL.—The term ‘date of recordal’ means the date on which a request for extension of protection that is filed after an international registration is granted is recorded on the International Register.

“(6) DECLARATION OF BONA FIDE INTENTION TO USE THE MARK IN COMMERCE.—The term ‘declaration of bona fide intention to use the mark in commerce’ means a declaration that is signed by the applicant for, or holder of, an international registration who is seeking extension of protection of a mark to the United States and that contains a statement that—

“(A) the applicant or holder has a bona fide intention to use the mark in commerce,

“(B) the person making the declaration believes himself or herself, or the firm, corporation, or association in whose behalf he or she makes the declaration, to be entitled to use the mark in commerce, and

“(C) no other person, firm, corporation, or association, to the best of his or her knowledge and belief, has the right to use such mark in commerce either in the identical form of the mark or in such near resemblance to the mark as to be likely, when used on or in connection with the goods of such other person, firm, corporation, or association, to cause confusion, or to cause mistake, or to deceive.

“(7) EXTENSION OF PROTECTION.—The term ‘extension of protection’ means the protection resulting from an international registration that extends to a Contracting Party at the request of the holder of the international registration, in accordance with the Madrid Protocol.

“(8) HOLDER OF AN INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION.—A ‘holder’ of an international registration is the natural or juristic person in whose name the international registration is recorded on the International Register.

“(9) INTERNATIONAL APPLICATION.—The term ‘international application’ means an application for international registration that is filed under the Madrid Protocol.

“(10) INTERNATIONAL BUREAU.—The term ‘International Bureau’ means the International Bureau of the World Intellectual Property Organization.

“(11) INTERNATIONAL REGISTER.—The term ‘International Register’ means the official collection of such data concerning international registrations maintained by the International Bureau that the Madrid Protocol or its implementing regulations require or permit to be recorded, regardless of the medium which contains such data.

“(12) INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION.—The term ‘international registration’ means the registration of a mark granted under the Madrid Protocol.

“(13) INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION DATE.—The term ‘international registration date’ means the date assigned to the international registration by the International Bureau.

“(14) NOTIFICATION OF REFUSAL.—The term ‘notification of refusal’ means the notice sent by an Office of a Contracting Party to the International Bureau declaring that an extension of protection cannot be granted.

“(15) OFFICE OF A CONTRACTING PARTY.—The term ‘Office of a Contracting Party’ means—

“(A) the office, or governmental entity, of a Contracting Party that is responsible for the registration of marks, or

“(B) the common office, or governmental entity, of more than 1 Contracting Party that is responsible for the registration of marks and is so recognized by the International Bureau.

“(16) OFFICE OF ORIGIN.—The term ‘office of origin’ means the Office of a Contracting Party with which a basic application was filed or by which a basic registration was granted.

“(17) OPPOSITION PERIOD.—The term ‘opposition period’ means the time allowed for filing an opposition in the Patent and Trademark Office, including any extension of time granted under section 13.

“SEC. 61. INTERNATIONAL APPLICATIONS BASED ON UNITED STATES APPLICATIONS OR REGISTRATIONS.

“The owner of a basic application pending before the Patent and Trademark Office, or the owner of a basic registration granted by the Patent and Trademark Office, who—

“(1) is a national of the United States,

“(2) is domiciled in the United States, or

“(3) has a real and effective industrial or commercial establishment in the United States, may file an international application by submitting to the Patent and Trademark Office a written application in such form, together with such fees, as may be prescribed by the Commissioner.

“SEC. 62. CERTIFICATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL APPLICATION.

“Upon the filing of an application for international registration and payment of the prescribed fees, the Commissioner shall examine the international application for the purpose of certifying that the information contained in the international application corresponds to the information contained in the basic application or basic registration at the time of the certification. Upon examination and certification of the international application, the Commissioner shall transmit the international application to the International Bureau.

“SEC. 63. RESTRICTION, ABANDONMENT, CANCELLATION, OR EXPIRATION OF A BASIC APPLICATION OR BASIC REGISTRATION.

“With respect to an international application transmitted to the International Bureau under section 62, the Commissioner shall notify the International Bureau whenever the basic application or basic registration which is the basis for the international application has been restricted, abandoned, or canceled, or has expired, with respect to some or all of the goods and services listed in the international registration—

“(1) within 5 years after the international registration date; or

“(2) more than 5 years after the international registration date if the restriction, abandonment, or cancellation of the basic application or basic registration resulted from an action that began before the end of that 5-year period.

“SEC. 64. REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF PROTECTION SUBSEQUENT TO INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION.

“The holder of an international registration that is based upon a basic application filed with the Patent and Trademark Office or a basic registration granted by the Patent and Trademark Office may request an extension of protection of its international registration by filing such a request—

“(1) directly with the International Bureau, or

“(2) with the Patent and Trademark Office for transmittal to the International Bureau,

if the request is in such form, and contains such transmittal fee, as may be prescribed by the Commissioner.

“SEC. 65. EXTENSION OF PROTECTION OF AN INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION TO THE UNITED STATES UNDER THE MADRID PROTOCOL.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the provisions of section 68, the holder of an international registration shall be entitled to the benefits of extension of protection of that international registration to the United States to the extent necessary to give effect to any provision of the Madrid Protocol.

“(b) IF UNITED STATES IS OFFICE OF ORIGIN.—An extension of protection resulting from an international registration of a mark shall not apply to the United States if the Patent and Trademark Office is the office of origin with respect to that mark.

“SEC. 66. EFFECT OF FILING A REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF PROTECTION OF AN INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION TO THE UNITED STATES.

“(a) REQUIREMENT FOR REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF PROTECTION.—A request for extension of protection of an international registration to the United States that the International Bureau transmits to the Patent and Trademark Office shall be deemed to be properly filed in the United States if such request, when received by the International Bureau, has attached to it a declaration of bona fide intention to use the mark in commerce that is verified by the applicant for, or holder of, the international registration.

“(b) EFFECT OF PROPER FILING.—Unless extension of protection is refused under section 68, the proper filing of the request for extension of protection under subsection (a) shall constitute constructive use of the mark, conferring the same rights as those specified in section 7(c), as of the earliest of the following:

“(1) The international registration date, if the request for extension of protection was filed in the international application.

“(2) The date of recordal of the request for extension of protection, if the request for extension of protection was made after the international registration date.

“(3) The date of priority claimed pursuant to section 67.

“SEC. 67. RIGHT OF PRIORITY FOR REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF PROTECTION TO THE UNITED STATES.

“The holder of an international registration with an extension of protection to the United States shall be entitled to claim a date of priority based on the right of priority within the meaning of Article 4 of the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property if—

“(1) the international registration contained a claim of such priority; and

“(2)(A) the international application contained a request for extension of protection to the United States, or

“(B) the date of recordal of the request for extension of protection to the United States is not later than 6 months after the date of the first regular national filing (within the meaning of Article 4(A)(3) of the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property) or a subsequent application (within the meaning of Article 4(C)(4) of the Paris Convention).

“SEC. 68. EXAMINATION OF AND OPPOSITION TO REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF PROTECTION; NOTIFICATION OF REFUSAL.

“(a) EXAMINATION AND OPPOSITION.—(1) A request for extension of protection described in section 66(a) shall be examined as an application for registration on the Principal Register under this Act, and if on such examination it appears that the applicant is entitled to extension of protection under this

title, the Commissioner shall cause the mark to be published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark Office.

"(2) Subject to the provisions of subsection (c), a request for extension of protection under this title shall be subject to opposition under section 13. Unless successfully opposed, the request for extension of protection shall not be refused.

"(3) Extension of protection shall not be refused under this section on the ground that the mark has not been used in commerce.

"(4) Extension of protection shall be refused under this section to any mark not registrable on the Principal Register.

"(b) NOTIFICATION OF REFUSAL.—If, a request for extension of protection is refused under subsection (a), the Commissioner shall declare in a notification of refusal (as provided in subsection (c)) that the extension of protection cannot be granted, together with a statement of all grounds on which the refusal was based.

"(c) NOTICE TO INTERNATIONAL BUREAU.—(1) Within 18 months after the date on which the International Bureau transmits to the Patent and Trademark Office a notification of a request for extension of protection, the Commissioner shall transmit to the International Bureau any of the following that applies to such request:

"(A) A notification of refusal based on an examination of the request for extension of protection.

"(B) A notification of refusal based on the filing of an opposition to the request.

"(C) A notification of the possibility that an opposition to the request may be filed after the end of that 18-month period.

"(2) If the Commissioner has sent a notification of the possibility of opposition under paragraph (1)(C), the Commissioner shall, if applicable, transmit to the International Bureau a notification of refusal on the basis of the opposition, together with a statement of all the grounds for the opposition, within 7 months after the beginning of the opposition period or within 1 month after the end of the opposition period, whichever is earlier.

"(3) If a notification of refusal of a request for extension of protection is transmitted under paragraph (1) or (2), no grounds for refusal of such request other than those set forth in such notification may be transmitted to the International Bureau by the Commissioner after the expiration of the time periods set forth in paragraph (1) or (2), as the case may be.

"(4) If a notification specified in paragraph (1) or (2) is not sent to the International Bureau within the time period set forth in such paragraph, with respect to a request for extension of protection, the request for extension of protection shall not be refused and the Commissioner shall issue a certificate of extension of protection pursuant to the request.

"(d) DESIGNATION OF AGENT FOR SERVICE OF PROCESS.—In responding to a notification of refusal with respect to a mark, the holder of the international registration of the mark shall designate, by a written document filed in the Patent and Trademark Office, the name and address of a person resident in the United States on whom may be served notices or process in proceedings affecting the mark. Such notices or process may be served upon the person so designated by leaving with that person, or mailing to that person, a copy thereof at the address specified in the last designation so filed. If the person so designated cannot be found at the address given in the last designation, such notice or process may be served upon the Commissioner.

"SEC. 69. EFFECT OF EXTENSION OF PROTECTION.

"(a) ISSUANCE OF EXTENSION OF PROTECTION.—Unless a request for extension of pro-

tection is refused under section 68, the Commissioner shall issue a certificate of extension of protection pursuant to the request and shall cause notice of such certificate of extension of protection to be published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark Office.

"(b) EFFECT OF EXTENSION OF PROTECTION.—From the date on which a certificate of extension of protection is issued under subsection (a)—

"(1) such extension of protection shall have the same effect and validity as a registration on the Principal Register; and

"(2) the holder of the international registration shall have the same rights and remedies as the owner of a registration on the Principal Register.

"SEC. 70. DEPENDENCE OF EXTENSION OF PROTECTION TO THE UNITED STATES ON THE UNDERLYING INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION.

"(a) EFFECT OF CANCELLATION OF INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION.—If the International Bureau notifies the Patent and Trademark Office of the cancellation of an international registration with respect to some or all of the goods and services listed in the international registration, the Commissioner shall cancel any extension of protection to the United States with respect to such goods and services as of the date on which the international registration was canceled.

"(b) EFFECT OF FAILURE TO RENEW INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION.—If the International Bureau does not renew an international registration, the corresponding extension of protection to the United States shall cease to be valid as of the date of the expiration of the international registration.

"(c) TRANSFORMATION OF AN EXTENSION OF PROTECTION INTO A UNITED STATES APPLICATION.—The holder of an international registration canceled in whole or in part by the International Bureau at the request of the office of origin, under Article 6(4) of the Madrid Protocol, may file an application, under section 1 or 44 of this Act, for the registration of the same mark for any of the goods and services to which the cancellation applies that were covered by an extension of protection to the United States based on that international registration. Such an application shall be treated as if it had been filed on the international registration date or the date of recordal of the request for extension of protection with the International Bureau, whichever date applies, and, if the extension of protection enjoyed priority under section 67 of this title, shall enjoy the same priority. Such an application shall be entitled to the benefits conferred by this subsection only if the application is filed not later than 3 months after the date on which the international registration was canceled, in whole or in part, and only if the application complies with all the requirements of this Act which apply to any application filed pursuant to section 1 or 44.

"SEC. 71. AFFIDAVITS AND FEES.

"(a) REQUIRED AFFIDAVITS AND FEES.—An extension of protection for which a certificate of extension of protection has been issued under section 69 shall remain in force for the term of the international registration upon which it is based, except that the extension of protection of any mark shall be canceled by the Commissioner—

"(1) at the end of the 6-year period beginning on the date on which the certificate of extension of protection was issued by the Commissioner, unless within the 1-year period preceding the expiration of that 6-year period the holder of the international registration files in the Patent and Trademark Office an affidavit under subsection (b) together with a fee prescribed by the Commissioner; and

"(2) at the end of the 10-year period beginning on the date on which the certificate of extension of protection was issued by the Commissioner, and at the end of each 10-year period thereafter, unless—

"(A) within the 6-month period preceding the expiration of such 10-year period the holder of the international registration files in the Patent and Trademark Office an affidavit under subsection (b) together with a fee prescribed by the Commissioner; or

"(B) within 3 months after the expiration of such 10-year period, the holder of the international registration files in the Patent and Trademark Office an affidavit under subsection (b) together with the fee described in subparagraph (A) and an additional fee prescribed by the Commissioner.

"(b) CONTENTS OF AFFIDAVIT.—The affidavit referred to in subsection (a) shall set forth those goods or services recited in the extension of protection on or in connection with which the mark is in use in commerce and the holder of the international registration shall attach to the affidavit a specimen or facsimile showing the current use of the mark in commerce, or shall set forth that any nonuse is due to special circumstances which excuse such nonuse and is not due to any intention to abandon the mark. Special notice of the requirement for such affidavit shall be attached to each certificate of extension of protection.

"SEC. 72. ASSIGNMENT OF AN EXTENSION OF PROTECTION.

"An extension of protection may be assigned, together with the goodwill associated with the mark, only to a person who is a national of, is domiciled in, or has a bona fide and effective industrial or commercial establishment either in a country that is a Contracting Party or in a country that is a member of an intergovernmental organization that is a Contracting Party.

"SEC. 73. INCONTESTABILITY.

"The period of continuous use prescribed under section 15 for a mark covered by an extension of protection issued under this title may begin no earlier than the date on which the Commissioner issues the certificate of the extension of protection under section 69, except as provided in section 74.

"SEC. 74. RIGHTS OF EXTENSION OF PROTECTION.

"An extension of protection shall convey the same rights as an existing registration for the same mark, if—

"(1) the extension of protection and the existing registration are owned by the same person;

"(2) the goods and services listed in the existing registration are also listed in the extension of protection; and

"(3) the certificate of extension of protection is issued after the date of the existing registration."

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date on which the Madrid Protocol (as defined in section 60(1) of the Trademark Act of 1946) enters into force with respect to the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on

H.R. 567, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 567, the Madrid Protocol Implementation Act, and urge the House to adopt the measure.

House Resolution 567 is the implementing legislation for the protocol related to the Madrid Agreement of the Registration of Marks, commonly known as the "Madrid Protocol." The bill is identical to legislation introduced in the preceding two Congresses and will send a signal to the international business community, United States businesses, and trademark owners that the 105th Congress is determined to help our Nation, and particularly our small businesses, become part of an inexpensive, efficient system that allows the international registration of marks.

As a practical matter, Mr. Speaker, ratification of the protocol and enactment of H.R. 567 will enable the American trademark owners to pay a nominal fee to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, which will then register the marks in the individual countries that comprise the European Union, or EU. Currently, American trademark owners must hire attorneys or agents in each individual country to acquire protection. This process, as my colleagues can conclude, is both laborious and expensive and discourages small businesses in particular and individuals from registering their marks in Europe.

The Madrid Protocol took effect in April of 1996 and currently binds 16 countries to its terms, but not the United States. Our participation in the protocol is critical not just for the world community, but for those American individuals and small businesses who otherwise lack the resources to acquire worldwide, country-by-country protection for their trademarks.

Mr. Speaker, opposition to the protocol and the substantive provisions of H.R. 567 is nonexistent, as best I can determine. However, a sticking point to ratification does exist. The State Department has been trying for some time to reconcile differences between the administration and the EU regarding the voting rights of the "intergovernmental" members of the protocol in the assembly established by the agreement. Under the protocol, the EU receives a separate vote in addition to the votes of its member States. The Secretary of State has been working tirelessly to reconcile differences with the EU regarding the voting rights issue and the result has been positive.

Mr. Speaker, I remain confident that the problem will be resolved in the not-too-distant future. Passage of this legislation is intended to encourage a positive outcome in the negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 567 is an important and noncontroversial bill that will greatly benefit those American businesses and other individuals who need to register their trademarks overseas in a quick and cost-effective manner. I implore my colleagues to pass the bill today.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I believe that my colleague has explained this matter very adequately, and I urge Members to vote for it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts. In closing let me say this, and I am sure the gentleman from Massachusetts will agree with me: I want to reiterate the fact that the Secretary of State and Under Secretary Stu Eizenstat have done yeoman's work in trying to get this difference of opinion resolved, and I feel fairly good about its coming to fruition before too long.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COBLE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I agree that Mr. Eizenstat has done yeoman's work and that the Secretary of State has done whatever the semantic equivalent of yeoman's work is.

Mr. COBLE. 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 North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 567.

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.

REGARDING AMERICAN VICTIMS OF TERRORISM

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 220) regarding American victims of terrorism, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 220

Whereas the traditional policy of the United States, reiterated by this Administration, has been to vigorously pursue and apprehend terrorists who have killed American citizens in other countries;

Whereas numerous American citizens have been killed by Palestinian terrorists, most of them in Israel or the Israeli administered territories, including 9 since the signing of the Oslo Accords in 1993, namely Nachshon Wachsmann (New York), Alisa Flatow (New Jersey), Sara Duker (New Jersey), Matthew Eisenfeld (Connecticut), Joan Davenney (Connecticut), David Boim (New York), Yaron Ungar (New York), Leah Stern (New Jersey), and Yael Botwin (California);

Whereas at least 20 of the terrorists suspected in the killings of American citizens in Israel or the Israeli administered territories during 1993-1997 have been identified by Israel as Mohammed Dief, Nabil Sharihi, Nafez Sabih, Imjad Hinawi, Abd al-Majid Dudin, Adel Awadallah, Ibrahim Ghneimat, and Mahmoud Abu Hanudeh, Abd al-Rahman Ghanelmat, Jamal al-Hur, Raid Abu Hamadayah, Mohammad Abu Wardah, Hassan Salamah, Abd Rabu Shaykh 'Id, Hamdallah Tzramah, Abd Al-Nasser Atallah Issa, Hataham Ibrahim Ismail, Jihad Mahammad Shaker Yamur, and Mohammad Abbasm;

Whereas, according to the Israeli Government, 10 of those 20 terrorist suspects are currently believed to be free men;

Whereas the Anti-Terrorism Act of 1987 permits the prosecution, in the United States, of individuals who murder American citizens abroad; and

Whereas the United States has previously acted to bring to justice those responsible for the deaths of American citizens and has established a precedence of United States intervention by demanding that Libyan leader Moammar Qaddafi transfer to the United States the Libyan terrorists suspected of bombing Pan Am flight 103: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That it is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the United States should demand the prosecution of all suspected perpetrators of these attacks against United States citizens;

(2) the United States should seek the co-operation of the Palestinian Authority and all other appropriate authorities in the prosecution of these cases; and

(3) the suspects should be tried in the United States unless it is determined that such action is contrary to effective prosecution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution now being considered.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FOX), for sponsoring H. Con. Res. 220, which expresses the sense of the Congress regarding the murder of U.S. citizens by Palestinian terrorists.

As Secretary of State Albright meets with Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu and PLO Chairman Yassir Arafat, it is critical that security concerns be the basis for any movement in the negotiations. In that vein, H. Con. Res. 220 recognizes that the traditional policy of our Nation is to vigorously