

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, last Friday a terrible tornado ripped through the heart of the district I represent in Southwest Ohio. Eight hundred homes were destroyed or damaged. The Cities of Blue Ash, Montgomery, and Loveland, Symmes, Sycamore and Deerfield Townships were the hardest hit. Dozens of businesses were damaged and destroyed, four people killed, 34 injured, and hundreds of southwest Ohioans are tonight without a home. Our hearts go out to these families who are now trying to put their lives back together.

The good news is that they are getting help. There has been a remarkable outpouring of support from their neighbors to help people pull their lives back together. I spent the last few days working along with State and local officials, the Red Cross, other volunteers, police and fire fighters, and Federal officials from SBA and FEMA.

People from every neighborhood in our region have come to help. Folks in our area have really rallied behind these hard-hit communities. Our prayers go out to the families, and our thanks and appreciation go out to all the hard-working volunteers, emergency management personnel and local officials who, I believe, have done an outstanding job at a very difficult time.

But we need more help. I urge President Clinton to take prompt action on Ohio Governor Bob Taft's request that Southwest Ohio be declared a Federal disaster area.

**ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER  
PRO TEMPORE**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 8, rule XX, 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 6 of rule XX.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken later today.

**MADRID PROTOCOL  
IMPLEMENTATION ACT**

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 769) 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. 769

*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 inter-governmental 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 protection 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 California (Mr. BERMAN) 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. 769, the bill 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.

I rise today in support of H.R. 769, the Madrid Protocol Implementation Act, and urge the House to adopt the measure.

House Resolution 769 is the implementing legislation for the Protocol Related to the Madrid Agreement on the Registration of Marks, commonly known as the Madrid Protocol. The bill is identical to legislation introduced in the preceding three Congresses, and will send a signal to the international business community, United States businesses, and trademark owners that the 106th 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 the enactment of H.R. 769 will enable 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 more commonly known as the EU. Currently, American trade-

mark attorneys must hire attorneys or agents in each individual country to acquire protection. This process is both laborious and expensive, and discourages small businesses and individuals from registering their marks in Europe.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 769 is an important and noncontroversial bill that will greatly help those American businesses and other individuals who need to register their trademarks overseas in a prompt and cost-effective manner. I implore my colleagues to pass the bill today, and want to express my thanks to the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN), the ranking member of the subcommittee, and the entire subcommittee membership and staff for that matter, who have worked very cooperatively in getting the bill to this point.

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

□ 1115

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

I rise in support of H.R. 769, a bill to implement the Madrid Protocol Agreement providing for an international registration system for trademarks.

I am strongly of the belief that the one-stop shop provided for in the Madrid Protocol whereby trademark applicants can file one application in their own country and in their own language and, in so doing, achieve worldwide protection for their trademarks is in the interest of American businesses.

But while the Protocol took effect 2 years ago, it may never achieve its purpose unless and until the U.S. elects to participate. However, the State Department has not forwarded the treaty to the Senate for ratification because of continuing concerns on the part of the United States regarding the voting rights of intergovernmental members of the Protocol.

In particular, under the Protocol, the European Union receives a separate vote in addition to the votes of its member states. The State Department is concerned that it is a violation of the concept of one vote per country and could set an unfortunate precedent in future international agreements.

While the State Department pursues its concerns with European Commission officials, I believe it is important that we in this body signal our support for the substantive provisions of the Protocol. I know of no opposition to these provisions, nor to this bill. I urge its support.

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

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). 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. 769.

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.

#### MAKING TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS IN TITLE 17, UNITED STATES CODE

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1189) to make technical corrections in title 17, United States Code, and other laws, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1189

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO TITLE 17, UNITED STATES CODE.

(a) EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN PERFORMANCES AND DISPLAYS ON EXCLUSIVE RIGHTS.—Section 110(5) of title 17, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “(A) a direct charge” and inserting “(i) a direct charge”; and

(2) by striking “(B) the transmission” and inserting “(ii) the transmission”.

(b) EPHEMERAL RECORDINGS.—Section 112(e) of title 17, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (10) as paragraphs (2) through (9), respectively;

(2) in paragraph (3), as so redesignated, by striking “(2)” and inserting “(1)”;

(3) in paragraph (4), as so redesignated—

(A) by striking “(3)” and inserting “(2)”;

(B) by striking “(4)” and inserting “(3)”;

(C) by striking “(6)” and inserting “(5)”;

and

(D) by striking “(3) and (4)” and inserting “(2) and (3)”;

(4) in paragraph (6), as so redesignated—

(A) by striking “(4)” each place it appears and inserting “(3)”;

(B) by striking “(5)” each place it appears and inserting “(4)”.

(c) DETERMINATION OF REASONABLE LICENSE FEES FOR INDIVIDUAL PROPRIETORS.—Chapter 5 of title 17, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating the section 512 entitled “**Determination of reasonable license fees for individual proprietors**” as section 513 and placing such section after the section 512 entitled “**Limitations on liability relating to material online**”; and

(2) in the table of sections at the beginning of that chapter by striking

“512. Determination of reasonable license fees for individual proprietors.”

and inserting

“513. Determination of reasonable license fees for individual proprietors.”

and placing that item after the item entitled

“512. Limitations on liability relating to material online.”.

(d) ONLINE COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT LIABILITY.—Section 512 of title 17, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (e)—

(A) by amending the caption to read as follows:

“(e) LIMITATION ON LIABILITY OF NONPROFIT EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS.—”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “INJUNCTIONS.—”; and

(2) in paragraph (3) of subsection (j), by amending the caption to read as follows:

“(3) NOTICE AND EX PARTE ORDERS.—”.

(e) INTEGRITY OF COPYRIGHT MANAGEMENT INFORMATION.—Section 1202(e)(2)(B) of title 17, United States Code, is amended by striking “category or works” and inserting “category of works”.

(f) PROTECTION OF DESIGNS.—(1) Section 1302(5) of title 17, United States Code, is amended by striking “1 year” and inserting “2 years”.

(2) Section 1320(c) of title 17, United States Code, is amended in the subsection caption by striking “ACKNOWLEDGEMENT” and inserting “ACKNOWLEDGMENT”.

#### SEC. 2. OTHER TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

(a) CLERICAL AMENDMENT TO TITLE 28, U.S.C.—The section heading for section 1400 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“**§ 1400. Patents and copyrights, mask works, and designs**”.

(b) ELIMINATION OF CONFLICTING PROVISION.—Section 5316 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking “Commissioner of Patents, Department of Commerce.”.

(c) CLERICAL CORRECTION TO TITLE 35, U.S.C.—Section 3(d) of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking “, United States Code”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) 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. 1189.

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. 1189, to make technical corrections to title 17 of the United States Code and other laws. An amended version of this bill is presented for passage under suspension of the rules.

The amendment to the reported bill makes further technical corrections to title 17 and other laws. As a result of two major copyright bills which were signed in law late in the 105th Congress, several technical errors need to be corrected in order to prevent confusion. H.R. 1189 corrects these errors by making purely technical amendments to the Copyright Act and other laws. H.R. 1189, Mr. Speaker, does not make any substantive changes in the law.

I am unaware of any opposition to this amendment, and I urge a favorable vote on H.R. 1189.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support also of H.R. 1189, a bill making technical corrections in title 17, the Copyright Act.

If ever a bill were truly technical, this is it. Our committee labored long, hard, and successfully last Congress to produce landmark legislation in the copyright area. The brevity of the bill before us today is testimony to a job well done by all concerned in that effort, and I commend those people.

I commend this technical corrections bill to my colleagues.

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

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and 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. 1189, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER MEDAL OF VALOR ACT OF 1999

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 46) to provide for a national medal for public safety officers who act with extraordinary valor above and beyond the call of duty.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 46

*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 “Public Safety Officer Medal of Valor Act of 1999”.

#### SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF MEDAL.

The President may award, and present in the name of Congress, a Medal of Valor of appropriate design, with ribbons and appurtenances, to a public safety officer who is cited by the Attorney General, on the advice of the Medal of Valor Review Board, for extraordinary valor above and beyond the call of duty.

#### SEC. 3. BOARD.

(a) BOARD.—There is established a permanent Medal of Valor Review Board (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the “Board”). The Board shall—

(1) be composed of 11 members appointed in accordance with subsection (b); and

(2) conduct its business in accordance with this Act.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The members of the Board shall be appointed as follows:

(A) Two shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(B) Two shall be appointed by the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

(C) Two shall be appointed by the Majority Leader of the Senate.

(D) Two shall be appointed by the Minority Leader of the Senate.

(E) Three shall be appointed by the President, one of whom shall have substantial experience in firefighting, one of whom shall have substantial experience in law enforcement, and one of whom shall have substantial experience in emergency services.