

turn, force the alleged infringer to lose the substantial investment made in the infringing business or product.

While we may question their motives, we do not question the right of a patent troll to sue for patent infringement, obtain damages, and seek a permanent injunction. However, the issuance of a permanent injunction should not be automatic upon a finding of infringement. Rather, when deciding whether to issue a permanent injunction, courts should weigh all the equities, including the "unclean hands" of the patent trolls, the failure to commercialize the patented invention, the social utility of the infringing activity, and the loss of invested resources by the infringer. After weighing the equities, the court may still decide to issue a permanent injunction, but at least the court will have ensured that the injunction serves the public interest. Section 6 accomplishes this goal.

Section 7 provides a much needed fix for the inter partes re-examination procedure, which provides third parties a limited opportunity to request that the PTO Director re-examine an issued patent. The limitations on the inter partes re-examination process so restrict its utility that it has been employed only a handful of times. Section 7 increases the utility of this re-examination process by relaxing its estoppel provisions. Further, it expands the scope of the re-examination procedure to include redress for all patent applications regardless of when filed.

Finally, Section 8 is similar to a provision in a bill we introduced during the 106th Congress. Section 8 addresses our concern that patents have been issued for the mere computer implementation of previously known inventions. The idea of implementing a method for doing business online should not, in and of itself, be sufficient to secure patent protection for that method of doing business. Section 8 creates a presumption of obviousness if the only "novelty" is in the fact that the method utilizes computer technology.

My colleague from Virginia, Mr. BOUCHER, and his staff deserve the greatest measure of recognition for their hard work in developing this legislation. In addition, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Courts, the Internet and Intellectual Property, Mr. SMITH, deserves credit for bringing these issues to the forefront with the numerous hearings on patent quality. Also deserving of thanks are the many constitutional scholars, policy advocates, private parties, and government agencies that contributed their time, thoughts, and drafting talents to this effort. I am pleased that, finally, a consensus has emerged among the various collaborators in support of the basic "post grant opposition" approach embodied in the legislation. This bill is the latest iteration of a process we started over 3 years ago.

Though we developed this bill in a highly collaborative and deliberative manner, I do not maintain that it is a "perfect" solution. Thus, I will remain open to suggestions for amending the language to improve its efficacy or rectify any unintended consequences.

As I have previously said: "The bottom line in this: there should be no question that the U.S. patent system produces high quality patents. Since questions have been raised about whether this is the case, the responsibility of Congress is to take a close look at the functioning of the patent system." Patent quality is key to continued innovation. Thus, we must

act during the 109th Congress to assure the highest level of patent quality.

HONORING DR. GARY LOUIS ROSE
M.D. ON THE OCCASION OF HIS
15TH YEAR OF PRACTICE IN
LEWISVILLE, TX

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 8, 2004

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the commitment of a very caring physician in my community, Dr. Gary L. Rose.

Dr. Rose came to our community 15 years ago and quickly established himself as one of the preeminent physicians in the area. Dr. Rose is an obstetrician. He has delivered thousands of babies in our area and provided consistently excellent professional medical care to his patients.

Mr. Speaker, almost anywhere I go in my district, I encounter families whose lives have been touched by Dr. Rose. They speak of him almost reverently about the high quality of care he has rendered throughout the time that he has practiced in our community. With patience and understanding he solves complex medical diagnostic dilemmas while serving the Lewisville community. He is also a technically gifted surgeon, and he has brought many a patient through a serious crisis in the operating room and back on the road to good health.

Mr. Speaker we are truly fortunate in my community to have the type of dedicated medical professional that Dr. Rose personifies, and I wish him every success during the continuance of his career in medicine.

SITUATION IN IRAQ

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 8, 2004

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, the President and Vice President insist that things are improving in Iraq and that all America must do is "stay the course."

Their evaluation of our situation in that troubled land has been challenged by many. And, of course, we all know that one cannot find a diagnosis until one admits that there is a serious problem.

One of the most gripping accounts of the situation in Iraq I have read recently was prepared by Wall Street Journal reporter Farnaz Fassihi. Regrettably, it appears that this reporter may be facing ramifications for speaking the truth. The New York Post has defended her editorially.

It is important for Americans to deal with the truth. I recommend reading this reporter's account as well as her defense by the New York Post.

[From the New York Post, Sept. 30, 2004]

WSJ EDITOR BACKS IRAQ SCREED

(By Keith J. Kelly)

Wall Street Journal Editor Paul Steiger has come to the defense of his beleaguered Baghdad correspondent, who blasted the war

in Iraq as a "disaster" that has deteriorated "into a raging barbaric guerilla war" that will haunt the United States for decades.

"Despite President Bush's rosy assessments, Iraq remains a disaster," Wall Street Journal reporter Farnaz Fassihi wrote in a group e-mail to friends that inadvertently became widely posted on the Web.

Yesterday, the e-mail was mentioned prominently on the journalism blog by Jim Romanesko on the Poynter.org site.

Steiger said Fassihi's missive included "a few expressions of purely personal opinion about the situation there."

But the Wall Street Journal editor said the musings in no way distorted his reporter's ability to deliver fair coverage from Baghdad.

In her e-mail, Fassihi laments, "Being a foreign correspondent in Baghdad these days is like being under virtual house arrest."

Fears of abductions have sharply curtailed reporters ability to cover events or move about.

"My most pressing concern every day is not to write a kick-ass story but to stay alive and make sure our Iraqi employees stay alive. In Baghdad I am a security personnel first, a reporter second."

She also said the "Iraqi government doesn't control most Iraqi cities." She said there are car bombs, assassinations, kidnappings and beheadings. "The situation, basically, means a raging barbaric guerilla war."

Steiger said: "Ms. Fassihi's private opinions have in no way distorted her coverage, which has been a model of intelligent and courageous reporting, and scrupulous accuracy and fairness."

FROM BAGHDAD—A WALL STREET JOURNAL
REPORTER'S E-MAIL TO FRIENDS

(By Farnaz Fassihi)

Being a foreign correspondent in Baghdad these days is like being under virtual house arrest. Forget about the reasons that lured me to this job: a chance to see the world, explore the exotic, meet new people in far away lands, discover their ways and tell stories that could make a difference.

Little by little, day-by-day, being based in Iraq has defied all those reasons. I am house bound. I leave when I have a very good reason to and a scheduled interview. I avoid going to people's homes and never walk in the streets. I can't go grocery shopping any more, can't eat in restaurants, can't strike a conversation with strangers, can't look for stories, can't drive in any thing but a full armored car, can't go to scenes of breaking news stories, can't be stuck in traffic, can't speak English outside, can't take a road trip, can't say I'm an American, can't linger at checkpoints, can't be curious about what people are saying, doing, feeling. And can't and can't. There has been one too many close calls, including a car bomb so near our house that it blew out all the windows. So now my most pressing concern every day is not to write a kick-ass story but to stay alive and make sure our Iraqi employees stay alive. In Baghdad I am a security personnel first, a reporter second.

It's hard to pinpoint when the 'turning point' exactly began. Was it April when the Fallujah fell out of the grasp of the Americans? Was it when Moqtada and Jish Mahdi declared war on the U.S. military? Was it when Sadr City, home to ten percent of Iraq's population, became a nightly battlefield for the Americans? Or was it when the insurgency began spreading from isolated pockets in the Sunni triangle to include most of Iraq? Despite President Bush's rosy assessments, Iraq remains a disaster. If under Saddam it was a 'potential' threat,