

celebrates her 50th birthday. Barbara Bass Bakar is a leader in our community whose commitment to quality health care, education, and the performing arts has greatly benefited our city. It is my honor to commend and thank her for her work.

Barbara has actively worked to promote better health care. Her efforts on behalf of the University of California, San Francisco's (UCSF) programs in the areas of cancer science and patient care have made a difference in many people's lives. She serves on the UCSF Board of Directors and helped to create the UCSF Foundation Wellness Lecture Series and the Raising Hope benefit series. With her husband, Gerson, she established the Gerson and Barbara Bass Bakar Distinguished Professor of Cancer Biology at UCSF's Cancer Research Institute.

Barbara's commitment to education is exemplified by her contributions to the Achievement Rewards for College Scientists (ARCF) Foundation, Inc. She has volunteered her time for many years on the Board of Directors of the ARCF Foundation and has been instrumental in their success at promoting science education in the U.S. through graduate scholarships.

In the arts community, Barbara is highly regarded for her service on the Board of the American Conservatory Theater. She has served on the Executive and Finance Committees of this resident professional theater. Barbara has also donated her time to the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art, including as a member of the Accessions Committee, and to the endowment committee of the Jewish Community Endowment Fund.

All of Barbara's contributions to our community life are in addition to her remarkable career in the business world. After successful tenures with Bloomingdales, Macy's California, and Burdines, she rose to the post of President and CEO of Emporium and Weinstocks. Prior to that, she served as Chair and CEO of I. Magnin. She also sits on the Board of Directors of the Bombay Company and the DFS Group Ltd. and DFS Holdings Ltd.

San Francisco is fortunate to count Barbara Bass Bakar among its residents as she continues to direct her considerable talents and energies toward improving our world. It is my honor to thank her and to join her husband, Gerson, in wishing her a Happy Birthday.

IN MEMORY OF RALPH LAIRD, JR.

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 2001

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a man who affected the lives of many during his career in public education and his community activities, Ralph Laird, Jr. Mr. Laird passed away on October 24 in Walnut Creek, California, after a long illness.

Ralph Laird, Jr., was born in Danville, Illinois on March 23, 1924. He graduated from Danville High School in 1942, served in an Army unit under the overall command of General George Patton in World War II, and re-

turned to the United States to attend the University of South Dakota under the G.I. Bill. Graduating in 1949, and later receiving his Masters Degree in Education from San Francisco State University, Mr. Laird was the only one of his brothers and sister to receive an education past the eighth grade.

Mr. Laird worked for nineteen years at John Swett High School in Crockett, California. It was here that he began an incredible career in education working as a teacher, coach, Vice Principal and, for the last five years of his service there, as Principal. He was the coach of the 1959 championship John Swett basketball team, the first such championship for the school in decades, and also participated in community activities as a manager of an East Vallejo Little League team, camp director for the Vallejo YMCA, and a father in the Indian Guides program.

Mr. Laird was the first principal of San Dimas High School in San Dimas, California, and later was principal of Amador High School in Pleasanton, California. He ended his career in education as Assistant Superintendent of the Amador School District, but remained active as a leader in the SIRS organization and was a member of the Pleasanton Library Board.

In his life, he was committed to helping every person rise to their full potential. In all his school positions, he served as a mentor, worked extra hours, supported new teachers, and stayed in touch with many students with whom he had worked during his thirty-five years in education. His dedication to public service in its most pure form—the education and nurturing of our children—is an example for all of us to strive for.

Beyond his professional life, Ralph Laird was also well known for his ability to tell a story or a joke on almost any subject. His obituary stated, "He never met a pun he didn't like." He brightened any room he walked into, and was the patriarch of a wonderful family. He will be sorely missed not just by his community, but by his family—including his wife of 54 years, Dorothy; his sons, John, James and Thomas; and three grandchildren. All those touched by him during his life will miss his friendship, leadership, good humor, and guidance.

REGARDING THE RESOLUTION OPPOSING THE IMPOSITION OF CRIMINAL LIABILITY ON INTERNET SERVICE PROVIDERS BASED ON THE ACTIONS OF THEIR USERS

HON. DAVID DREIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 2001

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, as the Internet has grown in importance to our economy and our culture, Congress has considered a succession of bills addressing unsavory conduct on the Internet. While many of these proposals have been well-intentioned, they have proposed widely differing, sometimes technologically unrealistic, or unconstitutional approaches to this important issue.

The Internet offers Americans an unprecedented avenue for communication and commerce, changing the way we work, play, shop, and communicate. This phenomenon, referred to by the United States Supreme Court as the "vast democratic fora of the Internet" can be attributed chiefly to the policy embraced by the House in an amendment to the Telecommunications Act of 1996 offered by my distinguished colleagues CHRIS COX and RON WYDEN, and that I was pleased to support.

The Cox-Wyden amendment ensures that Internet service providers, website hosts, portals, search engines, directories and others are not burdened by the threat of civil tort liability for content created or developed by others. This measure has provided welcome certainty and uniformity with regard to civil tort liability on the Internet, while in no way limiting remedies against the provider of illegal content.

However, criminal bills continue to take widely varying and often quite different approaches to this issue. In addition, foreign nations and courts in Europe and Asia are stepping up efforts to hold U.S. companies liable for website content located in the United States that is criminal under their laws, but entirely lawful under our First Amendment. There is even a Cyber-crime Treaty that the Clinton Administration has been negotiating with countries that are part of the Council of Europe that could restrict Congress' ability to legislate in this area if we do not act soon.

For these reasons, I believe that the 107th Congress must act to preserve strong criminal penalties against criminals on the Internet, while creating a uniform and sensible structure limiting service providers' liability for content that third parties have stored or placed on their systems, but that may violate some criminal law. Given the importance of U.S. global leadership in the Internet industry, and of keeping the Internet open so that individuals can communicate and do business with one another, we cannot afford to cede the initiative or authority in this important area.

ON RE-INTRODUCTION OF THE NOTIFICATION AND FEDERAL EMPLOYEE ANTI-DISCRIMINATION AND RETALIATION ACT

HON. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 2001

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, today I am making good on a promise I made during the last days of the previous Congress. During a press conference on October 24th last year announcing the introduction of H.R. 5516, the Notification and Federal Employee Anti-discrimination And Retaliation Act (the No FEAR Act) of 2000, I pledged to reintroduce this legislation on the first day of the 107th Congress. That day has arrived. I am pleased to introduce the No FEAR Act of 2001.

During that press conference, a spokesman for the NAACP noted the NAACP Task Force on Federal Sector Discrimination and other civil rights organizations are supporting this legislation. It was hailed as the first civil rights

legislation of the 21st Century. I would like to thank the courageous individuals and organizations, which have spoken out on the need for this legislation for their support.

I would also like to thank Representative SHEILA JACKSON-LEE and Representative CONNIE MORELLA for their support of this bill when it was first introduced. This year I have made some modifications to the bill which ensure that its contents do not otherwise limit the ability of federal employees to exercise other rights available to them under federal law. The new draft also requires federal agencies to report their findings to the Attorney General in addition to Congress. Finally, the legislation makes more explicit references to reimbursement requirements under existing law. I believe that these changes make a good bill better.

As the Chairman of the Committee on Science during the last Congress, I was very disturbed by allegations that EPA practices intolerance and discrimination against its scientists and employees. For the past year, the Committee on Science has investigated numerous charges of retaliation and discrimination at EPA, and unfortunately they were found to have merit.

The Committee held a hearing in March 2000, over allegations that agency officials were intimidating EPA scientists and even harassing private citizens who publicly voiced concerns about agency policies and science. While investigating the complaints of several scientists, a number of African-American and disabled employees came to the Committee expressing similar concerns. One of those employees, Dr. Marsha Coleman-Adebayo, won a \$600,000 jury decision against EPA for discrimination.

It further appears EPA has gone so far as to retaliate against some of the employees and scientists that assisted the Science Committee during our investigation. In one case, the Department of Labor found EPA retaliated against a female scientist for, among other things, her assistance with the Science Committee's work. The EPA reassigned this scientist from her position as lab director at the Athens, Georgia regional office effective November 5, 2000—a position she held for 16 years—to a position handling grants at EPA headquarters. In the October 3 decision, the Department of Labor directed EPA to cancel the transfer because it was based on retaliation.

EPA's response to these problems has been to claim that they have a great diversity program. Apparently, EPA believes that if it hires the right makeup of people, it does not matter if its managers discriminate and harass those individuals.

Diversity is great, but in and of itself, it is not the answer. Enforcing the laws protecting employees from harassment, discrimination and retaliation is the answer. EPA, however, does not appear to do this. EPA managers have not been held accountable when charges of intolerance and discrimination are found to be true. Such unresponsiveness by Administrator Browner and the Agency legitimizes this indefensible behavior.

Subsequent to the hearing, other federal employees have contacted me with information regarding their complaints of harassment and retaliation.

Federal employees with diverse backgrounds and ideas should have no fear of being harassed because of their ideas or the color of their skin. This bill would ensure accountability throughout the entire Federal Government—not just EPA. Under current law, agencies are held harmless when they lose judgments, awards or compromise settlements in whistleblower and discrimination cases.

The Federal Government pays such awards out of a government-wide fund. The No FEAR Act would require agencies to pay for their misdeeds and mismanagement out of their own budgets. The bill would also require Federal agencies to notify employees about any applicable discrimination and whistleblower protection laws and report to Congress and the Attorney General on the number of discrimination and whistleblower cases within each agency. Additionally, each agency would have to report on the total cost of all whistleblower and discrimination judgments or settlements involving the agency.

Federal employees and Federal scientists should have no fear that they will be discriminated against because of their diverse views and backgrounds. This legislation is a significant step towards achieving this goal.

NO TO A WORLD COURT

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 3, 2001

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member would ask his colleagues to consider carefully and submit the following editorial from the December 30, 2000, edition of the Omaha World-Herald, entitled "No to a World Court" into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the Omaha World-Herald, Dec. 20, 2000]

NO TO A WORLD COURT

America's political leaders are being wooed with a siren song they would do well to resist. Foreign governments, political activists and academics are sounding that song with the aim of enticing the United States into ratifying a treaty to create an International Criminal Court. The song goes something like this:

Turn away from old notions. Turn away from your antiquated allegiance to national sovereignty. Embrace a higher moral order. Recognize that if nations are to promote true justice, they must swallow their pride and bow to a higher authority, a court, that will decide questions of war crimes and genocide and see that wrongdoers receive the punishment they deserve.

If a treaty establishing the court is approved by 60 nations, the world would finally have a permanent international forum with the authority to prosecute masterminds of genocide and war crimes.

It is superficially appealing. But behind the high-minded sentiments lies an agenda hostile to U.S. interests.

Foreign governments and activists organizations have sent strong indications that they envision the court largely as a tool for reining in the assertion of U.S. power. Through its ability to prosecute American officials and military people, the court

would give anti-American critics a powerful new instrument for undermining U.S. military operations and intimidating U.S. leaders from launching future ones.

Creation of the court would also aid its boosters in their efforts to create a new standard for military operations, an "enlightened" standard that would, in effect, severely restrict U.S. military options under threat of international prosecution.

The eagerness of international activists to promote such extravagant legal claims was demonstrated this year when human rights groups tried unsuccessfully to haul NATO officials before an international tribunal investigating war crimes from the Yugoslav civil war. The activists claimed, without foundation, that NATO's 1999 bombing campaign violated international law in reckless disregard for civilians.

That air campaign, ironically, was marked not by callousness on the part of NATO officials but by the extraordinary lengths to which they sought to minimize casualties, civilian as well as military. Regrettable losses of civilian life occurred nonetheless, fanning the criticism of such interventions.

As if all this weren't enough, the proposed procedures for the International Criminal Court would place it in direct opposition to civil liberties guaranteed under the U.S. Constitution. Proceedings before the court would allow no trial by jury, no right to a trial without long delays, no right of the defendant to confront witnesses, no prohibition against extensive hearsay evidence and no appeals.

David Rivkin and Lee Casey, two American attorneys with extensive experience in international law, note that the court would serve as "police, prosecutor, judge, jury and jailer," with no countervailing authority to check its power.

Rivkin and Casey also point out that trying Americans under such conditions was precisely the sort of injustice that Thomas Jefferson warned against in the Declaration of Independence more than 200 years ago.

In listing the injustices committed by the British government, the Declaration heaped particular scorn on the way Americans had been abused by British vice-admiralty courts. Such courts, the Declaration said, had subjected American defendants "to a jurisdiction foreign to our constitution, and unacknowledged by our laws." The courts denied people "the benefits of Trial by Jury" and involved transporting them "beyond Seas to be tried for pretended offenses."

When the U.S. Constitution was drafted in the late 1780s, it specifically required that criminal trials be by jury and held in the state and district where the crime was committed.

The appropriate course for the United States would be to continue supporting international courts on an ad hoc basis, such as the Yugoslav tribunal, to meet the needs of particular situations. Such bodies have powers far more modest than that of the proposed court.

A chorus of foreign governments, advocacy groups and commentators has a far different agenda, however. They are urging the United States to sign and ratify the treaty creating the International Criminal Court. To hinder the court's creation, they say, would be the opposite of progressive.

But the siren song ought to be resisted. Otherwise, by bowing to foolhardy legal restrictions, the United States would be handing its clever critics the very chains with which they would bind this country. And so we would lose some of our ability to defend