

local grantees. Knowing the priorities and diverse needs of their individual communities, the local programs can use these funds to attend to individual children with concerns not addressed by other parts of the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I have attempted only to highlight the strengths of the substitute in this brief synopsis, but I want to give my full endorsement for the entirety of the legislation being put forth today. With the fiscal constraints we are faced with in the Nation today, I believe it is essential to strengthen accountability and results and produce quality programs that ensure children's welfare is being promoted, and I feel comfortable and confident that this bill helps us do so.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of the Goodling substitute to the Human Services Authorization Act of 1998.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this bill. It is imperative that we continue to fund projects that develop and enhance educational opportunities for our children. Reauthorizing the Community Services Block Grant and the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance program provides much needed aid to those who needed the most help.

It should be clear to all of us that education preserves the very qualities of humanity that we must uphold. As the great scholar Plutarch once wrote, "The very spring and root of honesty and virtue lie in good education."

By helping low-income families, Head Start provides financially-disadvantaged children the foundation for a good education, and it is this foundation that allows these children to excel in public schools. Such achievement can then carry them to college and beyond.

It is equally important to ensure the viability of Community Service Block Grants. This measure would continue the assistance that we already provide to States and local communities. Moreover, the measure continues the Federal government's partnership with a network of community action agencies and other neighborhood-based organizations as they strive to achieve the reduction of poverty, the revitalization of low-income communities, and the empowerment of low-income families and individuals in rural and urban areas to become fully self-sufficient.

Finally, it is vital that we provide adequate funds to the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program. With the ever-rising costs of home energy, we cannot forget those who often cannot afford such costs. All we have to do is look at my hometown of Houston, Texas, and the terrible heat crisis that resulted in loss of life. If we can provide assistance to low-income individuals, perhaps we could prevent future casualties.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this Head Start bill. I would also like to commend the Committee Chairman, Mr. GOODLING, for his strong leadership on this important bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am a very strong supporter of the Head Start program, but have had many concerns about the quality and the educational components of the Head Start program. I am pleased with this legislation because it further addresses quality and professional development. I am pleased that this legislation establishes "school readiness" as a goal of the Head Start program, and adds very specific education performance measures to the Head Start statute. The Head Start program has great potential, and I think that we

should continue to strive to improve the educational components of this valuable program.

I am also pleased that this bill infuses more money into quality—such as professional development, teachers' salaries, and overall quality improvements. I believe that the Head Start program must not be expanded at the expense of quality.

Finally, this bill addresses professional development by identifying specific skills that each classroom teacher should be able to demonstrate, as well as upgrading the degree requirements for the program so that a majority of classroom teachers will have at least an associate's degree by 2003. I am pleased that this bill also includes an amendment that I offered that will strengthen professional development and the quality of the program. My amendment would require Head Start grantees to develop or adopt, in consultation with experts in child development and classroom teachers, an assessment or evaluation instrument to be used by Head Start grantees when hiring classroom teachers.

We need to ensure that our Head Start teachers have mastered the skills to advance the intellectual and physical development of the children, improve school readiness, establish a safe and healthy environment, and support the social and emotional development of children. Again, I appreciate the Chairman's fine leadership on this bill, and strongly urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETRI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 2206, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

NEXT GENERATION INTERNET RESEARCH ACT OF 1998

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3332) to amend the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1999 and 2000 for the Next Generation Internet program, to require the Advisory Committee on High-Performance Computing and Communications, Information Technology, and the Next Generation Internet to monitor and give advice concerning the development and implementation of the Next Generation Internet program and report to the President and the Congress on its activities, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3332

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 "Next Generation Internet Research Act of 1998".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Congress finds that—

(1) United States leadership in science and technology has been vital to the Nation's prosperity, national and economic security, and international competitiveness, and there is every reason to believe that maintaining this tradition will lead to long-term continuation of United States strategic advantages in information technology;

(2) the United States investment in science and technology has yielded a scientific and engineering enterprise without peer, and that Federal investment in research is critical to the maintenance of United States leadership;

(3) previous Federal investment in computer networking technology and related fields has resulted in the creation of new industries and new jobs in the United States;

(4) the Internet is playing an increasingly important role in keeping citizens informed of the actions of their government; and

(5) continued inter-agency cooperation is necessary to avoid wasteful duplication in Federal networking research and development programs.

(b) ADDITIONAL FINDINGS FOR THE 1991 ACT.—Section 2 of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 (15 U.S.C. 5501) is amended by—

(1) striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following:

"(4) A high-capacity, flexible, high-speed national research and education computer network is needed to provide researchers and educators with access to computational and information resources, act as a test bed for further research and development for high-capacity and high-speed computer networks, and provide researchers the necessary vehicle for continued network technology improvement through research."; and

(2) adding at the end thereof the following:

"(7) Additional research must be undertaken to lay the foundation for the development of new applications that can result in economic growth, improved health care, and improved educational opportunities.

"(8) Research in new networking technologies holds the promise of easing the economic burdens of information access disproportionately borne by rural users of the Internet.

"(9) Information security is an important part of computing, information, and communications systems and applications, and research into security architectures is a critical aspect of computing, information, and communications research programs.".

SEC. 3. PURPOSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to authorize, through the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 (15 U.S.C. 5501 et seq.), research programs related to—

- (A) high-end computing and computation;
- (B) human-centered systems;
- (C) high confidence systems; and
- (D) education, training, and human resources; and

(2) to provide, through the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 (15 U.S.C. 5501 et seq.), for the development and coordination of a comprehensive and integrated United States research program which will—

(A) focus on the research and development of a coordinated set of technologies that seeks to create a network infrastructure that can support greater speed, robustness, and flexibility than is currently available and promote connectivity and interoperability among advanced computer networks of Federal agencies and departments;

(B) focus on research in technology that may result in high-speed data access for users that is both economically viable and does not impose a geographic penalty; and

(C) encourage researchers to pursue approaches to networking technology that lead

to maximally flexible and extensible solutions wherever feasible.

(b) MODIFICATION OF PURPOSES OF THE 1991 ACT.—Section 3 of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 (15 U.S.C. 5502) is amended by—

(1) striking the section caption and inserting the following:

"SEC. 3. PURPOSES.:"

(2) striking "purpose of this Act is" and inserting "purposes of this Act are";

(3) striking subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) and redesignating subparagraphs (B) through (I) as subparagraphs (A) through (H), respectively;

(4) striking "Network" and inserting "Internet" in paragraph (1)(B), as so redesignated by paragraph (3) of this subsection;

(5) striking "and" at the end of paragraph (1)(H), as so redesignated by paragraph (3) of this subsection;

(6) in paragraph (2), by striking "efforts." and inserting "network research and development programs;"; and

(7) adding at the end thereof the following:

"(3) promoting the more rapid development and wider distribution of networking management and development tools; and

"(4) promoting the rapid adoption of open network standards.".

SEC. 4. NATIONAL HIGH-PERFORMANCE COMPUTING PROGRAM.

(a) PROGRAM ELEMENTS.—Subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 101(a)(2) of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 (15 U.S.C. 5511(a)(2)(A) and (B)) are amended to read as follows:

"(A) provide for the development of technologies to advance the capacity and capabilities of the Internet;

"(B) provide for high performance testbed networks to enable the research, development, and demonstration of advanced networking technologies and to develop and demonstrate advanced applications made possible by the existence of such testbed networks;".

(b) ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—Section 101(b) of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 (15 U.S.C. 5511(b)) is amended by striking "HIGH-PERFORMANCE COMPUTING" in the subsection heading.

SEC. 5. NEXT GENERATION INTERNET.

Title I of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 (15 U.S.C. 5511 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 103. NEXT GENERATION INTERNET.

"(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The National Science Foundation, the Department of Energy, the National Institutes of Health, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the National Institute of Standards and Technology may support the Next Generation Internet program. The objectives of the Next Generation Internet program shall be to—

"(1) support research, development, and demonstration of advanced networking technologies to increase the capabilities and improve the performance of the Internet;

"(2) develop an advanced testbed network connecting a significant number of research sites, including universities, Federal research institutions, and other appropriate research partner institutions, to support networking research and to demonstrate new networking technologies; and

"(3) develop and demonstrate advanced Internet applications that meet important national goals or agency mission needs, and that are supported by the activities described in paragraphs (1) and (2).

"(b) DUTIES OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—The President's Information Technology Advisory Committee (established pursuant to section 101(b) by Executive Order No. 13035 of

February 11, 1997 (62 F.R. 7131), as amended by Executive Order No. 13092 of July 24, 1998), in addition to its functions under section 101(b), shall—

"(1) assess the extent to which the Next Generation Internet program—

"(A) carries out the purposes of this Act; and

"(B) addresses concerns relating to, among other matters—

"(i) geographic penalties (as defined in section 7(1) of the Next Generation Internet Research Act of 1998);

"(ii) the adequacy of access to the Internet by Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Hispanic Serving Institutions, and small colleges and universities (whose enrollment is less than 5,000) and the degree of participation of those institutions in activities described in subsection (a); and

"(iii) technology transfer to and from the private sector;

"(2) review the extent to which the role of each Federal agency and department involved in implementing the Next Generation Internet program is clear and complementary to, and non-duplicative of, the roles of other participating agencies and departments;

"(3) assess the extent to which Federal support of fundamental research in computing is sufficient to maintain the Nation's critical leadership in this field; and

"(4) make recommendations relating to its findings under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3).

"(c) REPORTS.—The Advisory Committee shall review implementation of the Next Generation Internet program and shall report, not less frequently than annually, to the President, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, and the Committee on Science, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on National Security of the House of Representatives on its findings and recommendations for the preceding fiscal year. The first such report shall be submitted 6 months after the date of enactment of the Next Generation Internet Research Act of 1998 and the last report shall be submitted by September 30, 2000.

"(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this section—

"(1) for the Department of Energy, \$22,000,000 for fiscal year 1999 and \$25,000,000 for fiscal year 2000;

"(2) for the National Science Foundation, \$25,000,000 for fiscal year 1999 and \$25,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, as authorized in the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 1998;

"(3) for the National Institutes of Health, \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 1999 and \$7,500,000 for fiscal year 2000;

"(4) for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 1999 and \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 2000; and

"(5) for the National Institute of Standards and Technology, \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 1999 and \$7,500,000 for fiscal year 2000.

Such funds may not be used for routine upgrades to existing federally funded communication networks.

SEC. 6. STUDY OF EFFECTS ON TRADEMARK RIGHTS OF ADDING GENERIC TOP-LEVEL DOMAINS.

(a) STUDY BY NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce shall request the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a comprehensive study, taking into account the diverse needs of domestic and international Internet users, of the

short-term and long-term effects on trademark rights of adding new generic top-level domains and related dispute resolution procedures.

(b) MATTERS TO BE ASSESSED IN STUDY.—The study shall assess and, as appropriate, make recommendations for policy, practice, or legislative changes relating to—

(1) the short-term and long-term effects on the protection of trademark rights and consumer interests of increasing or decreasing the number of generic top-level domains;

(2) trademark rights clearance processes for domain names, including—

(A) whether domain name databases should be readily searchable through a common interface to facilitate the clearing of trademark rights and proposed domain names across a range of generic top-level domains;

(B) the identification of what information from domain name databases should be accessible for the clearing of trademark rights; and

(C) whether generic top-level domain registrants should be required to provide certain information;

(3) domain name trademark rights dispute resolution mechanisms, including how to—

(A) reduce trademark rights conflicts associated with the addition of any new generic top-level domains; and

(B) reduce trademark rights conflicts through new technical approaches to Internet addressing;

(4) choice of law or jurisdiction for resolution of trademark rights disputes relating to domain names, including which jurisdictions should be available for trademark rights owners to file suit to protect such trademark rights;

(5) trademark rights infringement liability for registrars, registries, or technical management bodies;

(6) short-term and long-term technical and policy options for Internet addressing schemes and the impact of such options on current trademark rights issues; and

(7) public comments on the interim report and on any reports that are issued by intergovernmental bodies.

(c) COOPERATION WITH STUDY.—

(1) INTERAGENCY COOPERATION.—The Secretary of Commerce shall—

(A) direct the Patent and Trademark Office, the National Telecommunications and Information Administration, and other Department of Commerce entities to cooperate fully with the National Research Council in its activities in carrying out the study under this section; and

(B) request all other appropriate Federal departments, Federal agencies, Government contractors, and similar entities to provide similar cooperation to the National Research Council.

(2) PRIVATE CORPORATION COOPERATION.—The Secretary of Commerce shall request that any private, not-for-profit corporation established to manage the Internet root server system and the top-level domain names provide similar cooperation to the National Research Council.

(d) REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) INTERIM REPORT.—After a period of public comment and not later than 4 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the National Research Council shall submit an interim report on the study to the Secretary of Commerce.

(B) FINAL REPORT.—After a period of public comment and not later than 9 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the National Research Council shall complete the study under this section and submit a final report on the study to the Secretary of Commerce. The final report shall set forth the findings, conclusions, and recommendations

of the Council concerning the effects of adding new generic top-level domains and related dispute resolution procedures on trademark rights.

(2) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—

(A) INTERIM REPORT.—Not later than 7 days after the date on which the interim report is submitted to the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary shall submit the interim report to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, and to the Committee on Commerce, the Committee on Science, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

(B) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than 7 days after the date on which the final report is submitted to the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary shall submit the final report to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, and to the Committee on Commerce, the Committee on Science, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated \$800,000 for the study conducted under this section.

SEC. 7. DEFINITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this Act—

(1) GEOGRAPHIC PENALTY.—The term “geographic penalty” means the imposition of costs on users of the Internet in rural or other locations, attributable to the distance of the user from network facilities, the low population density of the area in which the user is located, or other factors, that are disproportionately greater than the costs imposed on users in locations closer to such facilities or on users in locations with significantly greater population density.

(2) INTERNET.—The term “Internet” means the international computer network of both Federal and non-Federal interoperable packet switched data networks.

(b) ADDITIONAL DEFINITION FOR THE 1991 ACT.—Section 4 of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 (15 U.S.C. 5503) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (5) and (6), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

“(4) ‘Internet’ means the international computer network of both Federal and non-Federal interoperable packet switched data networks;”.

□ 1230

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) each will control 20 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3332, the Next Generation Internet Research Act of 1998, amends the high-performance Computing Act of 1991 to authorize appropriations for the next generation Internet program for fiscal years 1999 and 2000. It was passed by a voice vote by the Committee on Science on May 13, 1998.

Today's Internet bears little resemblance to the original network that grew out of the work sponsored by the Defense Advanced Research Programs

Agency and later by the National Science Foundation. What started out as a relatively small but important network linking Department of Defense and research university computers has exploded into a highly integrated worldwide system used largely by commercial and other enterprises. From 1998 to 2002, for example, the number of Internet users worldwide is expected to grow from 148 million to 477 million. Over the same period business-to-business electronic commerce is expected to grow from \$78 billion to \$300 billion.

The explosive growth in Internet traffic and its increasing importance to commerce and research has highlighted the need for new technologies to increase the speed and capacity of the system. Indeed the current system suffers limitations that could slow communications costing users both time and money. The NGI program will develop many of the technologies that will help the Internet keep pace with the increased demands placed on it.

I have long been supportive of the NGI program in concept but was initially reluctant to endorse the program because the administration had not developed an adequate plan on how it would be managed and how the funds would be spent. It was only in July 1997 that a draft implementation plan was put forward by the administration, too late for the Committee on Science to authorize the program in the First Session of the 105th Congress. With the release of the final implementation plan in February 1998 the committee felt it had a justifiable basis to move ahead with legislation to authorize the NGI program. The result is the bill before us today.

The NGI program will support R&D of advanced networking technologies to improve Internet performance, develop an advanced testbed network to demonstrate new technologies and use new technologies to develop more sophisticated Internet applications. One major goal of this program is to connect 100 NGI sites at 100 times the speed of today's Internet and to connect an additional 10 NGI sites at a thousand times the speed of today's Internet.

Specifically the bill authorizes \$67 million for fiscal year 1999 and \$75 million for Fiscal Year 2000 for the NGI programs run by the following five agencies:

Department of Energy, National Science Foundation, the National Institutes for Health, NASA and the National Institute of Standards and Technology. None of the money authorized is to be used for routine upgrades but only for research related activities.

H.R. 3332 also authorizes research into improving Internet access for rural areas, minority institutions and small colleges and promoting technology transfer to the private sector. The President's Information Technology Advisory Committee is required to report annually to Congress and to

the President about the NGI program's progress in these and other areas.

In addition the bill directs the Secretary of Commerce to sponsor a National Academy of Sciences study that will look at the effects on trademark rights of adding new top-level domain names and make recommendations on how best to protect trademarks in the growing cyberspace economy. Eight hundred thousand dollars is authorized for this study.

H.R. 3332 is an excellent piece of legislation that will enhance a variety of fields and services including national defense, weather forecasting, air safety, telemedicine, the media, and education and research. And if that is not enough, it will also improve the quality of Internet service provided to the average consumer.

I would like to take a moment to thank my colleague, ranking minority member of the Committee on Science, the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN) for cosponsoring this bill with me. I believe we have crafted a bill that will earn the support of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle and both sides of the capital, and I thank the gentleman for all the time and insight he has contributed to this legislation. H.R. 3332 is an important and timely piece of legislation, and I ask my colleagues to support it.

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

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3332, the Next Generation Internet Research Act of 1998. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) the chairman of the Committee on Science and also the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN) the ranking democratic Member, for their efforts to develop the bill and to bring it before the House.

H.R. 3332 authorizes the Next Generation Internet initiative which will support the research and development activities necessary to expand the capacity and capabilities to the Internet to meet the growing demands placed upon it. The applications that are straining the current Internet or even exceed its capabilities are coming largely from the research and education communities.

Achieving the goals of the Next Generation Internet initiative will require leading-edge research on networking hardware and software technologies. It also will require the creation of a large-scale high-performance testbed network. This testbed network will provide connectivity among many academic, industry and government user sites. It can then be used to implement challenging applications that will test the new networking technologies and ensure that they are scalable to the worldwide network.

In short, this initiative is a collaborative research project to develop and

demonstrate next generation networking technology in a realistic network environment.

This bill will amend the high-performance Computing Act of 1991 to incorporate the Next Generation Initiative Internet initiative within the existing coordinated multi-agency research and development effort in advanced computing and network research. The bill provides general authority for agencies carrying out activities under the 1991 act to advance the capacity and capabilities of the Internet and to develop and demonstrate high-performance testbed networks.

In addition, this bill explicitly authorizes the participating agencies to implement this initiative and task that presidentially appointed advisory committee for high-performance computing and networking activities to provide periodic critical assessment of the initiative. The funding authorization provided by the bill is consistent with the level of the President's budget request, and the administration fully supports passage of this legislation.

The Internet is one of the best examples of a Federal research and development investment that resulted in significant public benefits. It is a growing and increasingly important communications medium for commerce as well as for education and research uses and for personal communications.

This initiative authorized by this bill builds on past successes of Federal R&D and provides support of research needed to accelerate the development of the technologies. It will make it faster, more dependable, which will result from this initiative, enable new applications and crisis management and response, distance education, environmental monitoring, health care delivery and scientific research to name a few. In a very real way it will help shape the future, and I urge my colleagues to support and pass this bill.

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. Does the gentlewoman from Texas have any further speakers?

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, as you know, the Committee on Commerce has a strong interest in the development of the Internet, and over the past year has held more than a dozen hearings on the subject of electronic commerce. Among the provisions in the legislation currently before the House are authorizations of appropriations for the National Institutes of Health to engage in activities related to its participation in the Next Generation Internet program, as well as a study on the addition of new generic top-level Internet domains. Both of these matters fall within the Commerce Committee's jurisdiction under Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I have reviewed these provisions and have no objections. At this point, I

will insert in the RECORD an exchange of letters between Chairman SENSENBRENNER and myself regarding the Commerce Committee's desire to see this legislation move forward.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, September 11, 1998.

Hon. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, Jr.,
Chairman, Committee on Science, Rayburn
House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR JIM: On May 13, 1998, the Committee on Science ordered reported H.R. 3332, the Next Generation Internet Research Act of 1998. Among other provisions, this bill authorizes appropriations for the National Institutes of Health ("NIH") to engage in activities related to its participation in the Next Generation Internet program, as well as a study on the addition of new generic top-level Internet domains. Both of these matters fall within the Committee's jurisdiction under Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

Because of the importance of this matter, I recognize your desire to bring this legislation before the House in an expeditious manner. Therefore, I will waive consideration of the bill by the Commerce Committee. By agreeing to waive its consideration of the bill, the Commerce Committee does not waive its jurisdiction over these provisions or similar legislation. In addition, the Commerce Committee reserves its authority to seek conferees on the provisions of the bill that are within the Commerce Committee's jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference that may be convened on this legislation. I request that you support any request by the Commerce Committee for conferees on this or similar legislation.

I also request that you submit this letter for the record during consideration of H.R. 3332 on the House floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

TOM BLILEY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE,
Washington, DC, September 11, 1998.

Hon. THOMAS BLILEY,
Chairman, House Committee on Commerce,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of September 11, 1998 concerning H.R. 3332, the Next Generation Internet Research bill.

I appreciate your willingness to waive consideration of the bill of the Committee on Commerce so that the Science Committee may expedite consideration of the bill on the floor of the House.

The Committee on Science acknowledges Commerce Committee jurisdiction over the National Institutes of Health and its telecommunications jurisdiction over Internet domain names. Recognizing this I will support your request for conferees on these provisions should the Science Committee seek a House-Senate conference that may be convened on this legislation.

I will submit this exchange of letters for the record during consideration of H.R. 3332 on the House floor.

Sincerely,

F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, Jr.,
Chairman.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this bill, the Next Generation Internet Act of 1998, which amends the High Performance Computing Act (HCPA) of 1991 to expand our development of an Internet that is faster, more powerful, and more available to the people of the United States than ever before.

The Next Generation Internet (NGI) Program, created by this bill, authorizes funds from the National Science Foundation (NSF), the Department of Energy, NASA, the National Institutes of Health (NIH), and the National Institutes of Standards and Technology, to be spent on researching and developing advanced networking technologies which can be used to bolster the performance of the Internet, as we know it today.

As you all know, the Internet has become an important tool in the advancement of education, business, and even politics. For schoolchildren, it presents a window to the world, far less expensive than a set of encyclopedias, yet far more voluminous and varied. It is important for business, because it allows entrepreneurs to present their products in an interactive and compelling manner, which can also be easily adapted to satisfy the needs of the American, and international customer.

The Internet is important to the citizens of this great country because it gives each of them an equal voice. We receive hundreds of e-mails every month from concerned citizens, who feel obligated to participate in the political process, and who now have the ability to instantaneously reach their representative here in Congress. That is invaluable. We must continue to support programs like NGI, so that we can further mine the Internet for the good it can bring the global community.

I am also happy to report to you that this bill contains an important provision which I added during its markup in the Judiciary Committee. The amendment directs the Advisory Committee to address and make recommendations on the participation of "Historically Black Colleges, Hispanic Serving Institutions, and small colleges and universities" in the Next-Generation Internet Program.

This important provision provides a tremendous benefit to minority serving universities and small colleges who need guidance on how to gain better access to the Internet, as well as how they can participate in exciting Internet research programs, like NGI. We cannot let these important institutions fall through the digital divide, and remain fundamentally "disconnected" from the rest of the world.

I strongly urge you all to join me in support of the Internet, and of these important institutions by supporting this bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3332, 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.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read, "A bill to amend the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1999 and 2000 for the Next Generation Internet program, to require the President's Information Technology Advisory Committee to monitor and give advice concerning the development and implementation of the Next Generation Internet program and report to the President and the Congress

on its activities, and for other purposes.”.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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 on H.R. 3332, the legislation just passed.

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

There was no objection.

POSTAL EMPLOYEES SAFETY ENHANCEMENT ACT

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 2112) to make the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 applicable to the United States Postal Service in the same manner as any other employer.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 2112

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 “Postal Employees Safety Enhancement Act”.

SEC. 2. APPLICATION OF ACT.

(a) DEFINITION.—Section 3(5) of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 652(5)) is amended by inserting after “the United States” the following: “(not including the United States Postal Service)”.

(b) FEDERAL PROGRAMS.—

(1) OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH.—Section 19(a) of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 668(a)) is amended by inserting after “each Federal Agency” the following: “(not including the United States Postal Service)”.

(2) OTHER SAFETY PROGRAMS.—Section 7902(a)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after “Government of the United States” the following: “(not including the United States Postal Service)”.

SEC. 3. CLOSING OR CONSOLIDATION OF OFFICES NOT BASED ON OSHA COMPLIANCE.

Section 404(b)(2) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(2) The Postal Service, in making a determination whether or not to close or consolidate a post office—

“(A) shall consider—

“(i) the effect of such closing or consolidation on the community served by such post office;

“(ii) the effect of such closing or consolidation on employees of the Postal Service employed at such office;

“(iii) whether such closing or consolidation is consistent with the policy of the Government, as stated in section 101(b) of this title, that the Postal Service shall provide a maximum degree of effective and regular postal services to rural areas, communities, and small towns where post offices are not self-sustaining;

“(iv) the economic savings to the Postal Service resulting from such closing or consolidation; and

“(v) such other factors as the Postal Service determines are necessary; and

“(B) may not consider compliance with any provision of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 651 et seq.).”.

SEC. 4. PROHIBITION ON RESTRICTION OR ELIMINATION OF SERVICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 4 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding after section 414 the following:

“§ 415. Prohibition on restriction or elimination of services

“The Postal Service may not restrict, eliminate, or adversely affect any service provided by the Postal Service as a result of the payment of any penalty imposed under the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 651 et seq.).”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 4 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“415. Prohibition on restriction or elimination of services.”.

SEC. 5. LIMITATIONS ON RAISE IN RATES.

Section 3622 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) Compliance with any provision of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 651 et seq.) shall not be considered by the Commission in determining whether to increase rates and shall not otherwise affect the service of the Postal Service.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING).

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

Mr. Speaker, speaking for the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD), S. 2112 passed the Senate by unanimous consent on July 31, 1998. The bill is nearly identical to H.R. 3725 which was introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD). H.R. 3725 was passed by the Committee on Education and the Workforce on June 10 by voice vote, passed by the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight on July 23 by voice vote. S. 2123 allows the Occupational Safety and Health Administration to issue citations and fines against the U.S. Postal Service for violations of OSHA standards and requirements in postal facilities and workplaces. Under the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 the Postal Service monitors its own compliance with OSHA requirements, and while OSHA may conduct inspections of postal facilities OSHA may not issue citations or penalties.

As the U.S. Postal Service competes more and more directly with private companies, it is appropriate that it do so on a level playing field with regard to such issues as compliance with safety and health regulations. Furthermore, worker safety has been a significant concern at the U.S. Postal Service, concern that has often been blamed in the lack of OSHA enforceability. For both of these reasons we believe it time to bring the postal service under OSHA enforcement. We are pleased that the Senate has agreed and has already passed this bill. By passing the Senate bill today we can send the bill on to the President for his signature.

I want to particularly commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) for his efforts in moving his bill through two committees of the House and also commend Senator ENZI for moving his bill through the Senate, and I urge support for this legislation.

The U.S. Postal Service has raised two issues with the language of S. 2112. I would note that the Postal Service has raised these concerns only in recent days, after S. 2112 was passed by the Senate and companion bills were passed by two committees of the House. Nonetheless I do want to address the Postal Service's concerns.

First, the Postal Service expresses concern that S. 2112 does not include a delay in the effective date of the legislation. The Postal Service has, since 1970, been subject to section 19 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act, which obligates the Postal Service to “establish and maintain an effective and comprehensive safety and health program which is consistent with [OSHA standards.]” So for the most part, S. 2112 does not subject the Postal Service to new standards and requirements. It simply gives OSHA the authority to enforce those standards and requirements. However, there may be a few specific new requirements as a result of the enactment of S. 2112, particularly, with regard to recording injuries and illnesses. Similarly, some state OSHA programs, which under S. 2112 will have enforcement jurisdiction over Postal Service facilities in 21 states, may have requirements that deviate from the federal requirements which the Postal Service was required to meet under section 19.

Where there are these new requirements, I encourage the Postal Service to work with OSHA and the state programs on a reasonable period for coming into full compliance as quickly as possible. And I would expect that similarly OSHA and the state OSHA agencies would work with the Postal Service, to bring the Postal Service into full compliance as quickly as possible. Given the discretion that these enforcement agencies have, I do not believe that a legislated delay in effective date is necessary, particularly given the fact that for the most part the Postal Service has been long subject to most of OSHA's standards, and that where there are changes and new requirements, a reasonable time for coming full compliance can be worked out between OSHA or the states and the Postal Service.

Second, the Postal Service has raised concerns with the language used in section 5 of S. 2112. Section 5 amends section 3622 of title 39 of the U.S. Code to add the following provision: “Compliance with any provision of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 shall not be considered by the Commission in determining whether to increase rates and shall not otherwise affect the service of the Postal Service.” The Postal Service has claimed that this language could mean that the Postal Service would not be able to spend any funds generated from postal fees and rates to fund its safety and health programs and expenditures necessary to comply with OSHA standards, regulations, and the general duty clause.

This concern is unwarranted. First of all, the interpretation suggested by the Postal Service would be absurd: the purpose of S. 2112 is to improve safety and compliance with OSHA standards at Postal Service workplaces. The