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 judgements, 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 judgements 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-