HeinOnline

Citation: 1 William H. Manz Federal Copyright Law The Histories of the Major Enactments of the 105th 19117 1999

Content downloaded/printed from HeinOnline (http://heinonline.org) Mon Apr 8 19:35:43 2013

- -- Your use of this HeinOnline PDF indicates your acceptance of HeinOnline's Terms and Conditions of the license agreement available at http://heinonline.org/HOL/License
- -- The search text of this PDF is generated from uncorrected OCR text.

including strengthening of jurisdictional provision.

Section 1103: Narcotics-related public corruption Adopts special provisions for drug-related

public corruption, including severe penalties. TITLE XII-ADMINISTRATIVE SUBPONEA

Section 1201: Administrative summons authority of United States Secret Service

of United States Secret Service Allows high-ranking Secret Service agents to issue an administrative subponea for in-formation in cases in which the President or other federal protectees are in danger. The Department of Agriculture, the Resolution Trust Corporation, and the Food and Drug departs of the provide the second and Drug Administration already have administrative subponea power

TITLE XIII-COMPLICER CRIMES

Section 1301: Protection of classified government information

Penalizes individuals who deliberately break into a computer, or attempt to do so, without authority and, thereby, obtain and disseminate classified information.

Section 1302: Protection of financial,

government, and other computer information government, and other computer information Makes interstate or foreign theft of infor-mation by computer a crime. This provision is necessary in light of United States v. Brown, 925 F.2d 1301, 1308 (10th Cir. 1991), where the court held that purely intangible intellectual property, such as computer pro-grams, cannot constitute goods, wares, mer-chandise, securities, or monies which have been stolen, converted, or taken within the meaning of 18 U.S.C. §2314.

Section 1303: Protection of government computer systems

Makes two changes to §1030(a)(3), which currently prohibits intentionally accessing, currently promotes intentionally accessing, without authorization, computers used by, or for, any department or agency of the United States and thereby "adversely" af-fecting "the use of the Government's oper-ation of such computer." First, it deletes the word "adversely" since this term suggest, inaction of such computer. word "adversely" since this term suggest, in-appropriately, that trespassing in a govern-ment computer may be benign. Second, the bill replaces the phrase "the use of the Gov-ernment's operation of such computer" with the term "that use." When a computer is the term that use." When a computer is the term that use." used for the government, the government is not necessarily the operator, and the old phrase may lead to confusion. The bill makes a similar change to the definition of "pro-tected computer" in §1030(e)(2)(A).

Section 1304: Increased penalties for significant unauthorized use of a computer system

Amends 18 U.S.C. \$1030(a)(4) to insure that felony level sanctions apply when unauthor-ized use or use in excess of authorization is significant

Section 1305: Protection from damage to computer systems

Amends 18 U.S.C. § 1030(a) (5) to further protext computer systems covered by the stat-tionally damages a computer, regardless of whether they were authorized to access the computer

Section 1306: Protection from threats directed against computer systems

against computer systems Adds a new section to 18 U.S.C. §1030(a) to provide penalties for the interstate trans-mission of threats directed against comput-ers and computer networks. The new section covers any interstate or international trans-mission of threats against computers, com-puter networks, and their data and pro-grams, whether the threat is received by mall, telephone, electronic mall, or through a computerized messaging service.

Section 1307: Increased penalties for recidivist and other sentencing changes

Amends 18 U.S.C. 1030(c) to increase pen-alties for those who have previously violated

any subsection of §1030. This section pro-vides that anyone who is convicted twice of committing a computer offense under §1030 would be subject to enhanced penalties.

Section 1308: Civil actions

damage to economic damages, violation caused a loss of \$1,000 or Limits where the more during any one-year period. No limit on damages would be imposed for violations that modified or impaired the medical examination, diagnosis or treatment of a person; caused physical injury to any person; or threatened the public health or safety.

Section 1309: Mandatory reporting

The current reporting requirement under \$1030(a)(5) is eliminated. By ensuring that most high technology crimes can be pros-ecuted, there is less need for reporting reguirements. Convictions will provide more information on computer crime. To create a mandatory reporting requirement is unnec-essary because private sector groups, such as the Forum of Incident Response and Secu-rity Teams (FIRST), are leading the effort to monitor computer crimes statistically.

Section 1310: Sentencing for fraud and related activity in connection with computers.

Requires the United States Sentencing Commission to review existing sentencing guidelines as they apply to sections 1030 (a)(2), (a)(3), (a)(4), (a)(5), and (a)(6) of Title 18of the United States Code (The ComputerFraud and Abuse Act). The Commission mustalso establish guidelines to ensure that criminals convicted under these sections receive mandatory minimum sentences for not less than 1 year. Currently, judges are given great discretion in sentencing under the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act. In many Computer Fraud and Abuse Act. In many cases, the sentences don't match the crimes; and criminals receive light sentences for se-rious crimes. Mandatory minimum sentences will deter computer "hacking" crimes, and protect the infrastructure of computer systems.

Section 1311: Asset forfeiture for fraud and related activity in connection with computers

Amends 18 U.S.C. \$1030(a)(2), (a)(3), and (a)(4) to insure that individuals who commit under the aforementioned sections will forfeit the property used in connection with those crimes. For example, computers and "hacking" software used in crimes would be subject to forfeiture.

TITLE XIV-COMPUTER SOFTWARE PIRACY

Section 1401: Amendment of title 17 Amends 17 U.S.C. \$505(a) to extend crimi-nal infringement of copyright to include any person-not just those who acted for pur-poses of commercial advantage or private fiposes of commercial advantage or private in-nancial gain-who willfully infiringes a copy-right. Corrects the problem highlighted by the United States v. LaMacchia, 871 F. Supp. 535 (D. Mass. 1994), that a person could pirate software maliciously, so long as they received no financial gain.

Section 1402: Amendment of title 18

Amends 18 U.S.C. 2319 to allow the court. Amends 18 0.5.0. 2319 to allow the court, in imposing a sentence on a person convicted of software piracy, to order that the person forfeit any property used or intended to be used to commit or promote the commission of such offense.

TITLE XV-INTERNET GAMBLING

Section 1501: Amendment of title 18 Amends 18 U.S.C. §1084 to insure that indi-

viduals who gamble or wager via wire or electronic communication are penalized---not just those who are in the business of gam-bling. Current statutes make it illegal only if you are in the business of sports gambling mbling in Jose and in the business of sports gallining on the INTERNET. This section would make it illegal to gamble on "virtual casinos" as well as electronic sports books.

Section 1502: Sentencing guidelines Requires the United States Sentencing commission to review the deterrent effect of Com existing sentencing guidelines as they apply to sections 1084 of Title 18 and promulgate guidelines to ensure that criminals con-victed under section 1084 receive mandatory minimum sentences for not less than one year

Section 1503: Reporting requirements

Section raws: reporting requirements Requires the Attorney General to report to Congress on (1) the problems associated with enforcing INTERNET gambling, (2) rec-ommendations for the best use of resources ommendations for the best use of resources of the Department of Justice to enforce sec-tion 1084 of Title 18, (3) recommendations for the best use of the resources of FCC to en-force section 1084 of title 18, and (4) an estimat on the amount of gambling activity on the INTERNET. It is not clear how effective law enforcement can police the INTERNET. A report may answer that question.

y Mr. SIMON (for himself, HATCH, Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, BOND, and Mr. ASHCROFT): Bу Mr. Mr.

S. 1496. A bill to grant certain patent right for certain non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs for a 2-year period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPERTY RIGHT PROTECTION LEGISLATION Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, today, I introduce legislation to grant for a 2year period additional property right protection for oxaprozin, an important drug in treating arthritis. Oxaprozin is a non-steroidal, anti-inflammatory drug [NSAID]. It is produced and mar-keted as Daypro by the G.D. Searle & Co., headquartered in Skokie, IL. I am introducing this legislation as a matter of simple fairness and equity because of a protracted review by the Food and Drug Administration [FDA] that consumed the entire patent life

Daypro. The Drug Price Competition and Pat-ent Term Restoration Act of 1984, commonly referred to as the Hatch-Waxman Act, was designed in part to address the unfairness caused by unduly long FDA reviews. Unfortunately, the two major protections created by Hatch-Waxman did not remedy Daypro's situation. First, Hatch-Waxman provides patent extensions in cases of regulatory delay. Ironically, since the FDA review consumed Daypro's entire patent life, the delay rendered Daypro ineligible for a patent extension; Hatch-Waxman simply did not contemplate that an FDA review would consume the entire patent life of a drug prior to its approval. Second, Hatch-Waxman allows up to 10 years of market exclusivity to brand name drug manufacturers following protracted FDA review. If the FDA had promptly approved Daypro, Daypro would have been protected for 10 years; however, as a result of the delay, Daypro only re-ceived 5 years of marketing exclusivity protection.

protection. The legislation I am introducing today would provide Daypro 2 years of property right protection beyond the 5 years provided in the Hatch-Waxman Act. This additional property right rotaction is being sought because the protection is being sought because the

December 21, 1995

HeinOnline -- 1 William H. Manz, Federal Copyright Law: The Legislative Histories of the Major Enactments of the 105th Congress 19118 1999

Document No. 18

.