HEINONLINE

Citation: 1 Wireless Telephone Protection Act P.L. 105-172 112
53 April 24 1998 S12484 1998

Content downloaded/printed from
HeinOnline (http://heinonline.org)
Mon Apr 8 17:27:11 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.

mammography has been established. It requires that facilities use only properly trained personnel, establishes a control program to ensure the reliability, clarity, and accurate interpretation of the mammogram, and now each facility undergoes an annual inspection.

Breast cancer is currently the second leading cause of cancer deaths among American women. One woman in eight will develop breast cancer during her lifetime, and, during the nineties, it is estimated that 500,000 women will die from the disease. If breast cancer is detected early, however, the probability that a woman can survive is greater than 90 percent.

Currently, the most effective technique for early detection of breast cancer is mammography, an x ray procedure that can often locate small tumors and abnormalities up to 2 years before they can be detected by physical examination. However, mammography is one of the most technically challenging x ray procedures, and ensuring the quality of mammography services is difficult. To address concerns about variations in the quality of mammography service provided by the more than 10,000 facilities throughout the United States and its territories, the Congress passed the Mammography Quality Standards Act of 1992.

This reauthorization continues an important program that gives the women of America and their families an assurance that the quality of services for this vital test has improved, and will, hopefully, encourage even greater numbers to take advantage of this life saving diagnostic tool.•

NEW REPORT DOCUMENTING THE RISKS OF PRIVATIZING SOCIAL SECURITY

• Mr. REID. Mr. President, in the last several years a virtual cottage industry has sprung up in this city to promote the privatization of this Nation's Social Security system.

Phase out, partially privatize, or dismantle Social Security entirely, say the privatization advocates, and let each American citizen invest their payroll tax on Wall Street and become a millionaire by retirement. With Social Security requiring adjustments to maintain its long-term solvency, and the Dow Jones until recent days seeming to hit stratospheric highs almost every day, the notion of letting the private markets provide for retirement has had a certain appeal for privatizers.

Now a thoughtful and extremely sobering new economic analysis is warning us to plant our feet back on solid ground and take a hard look at the very considerable and too-little discussed risks of privatizing Social Security.

On October 21, 1997 I was pleased to sponsor a congressional staff briefing which unveiled a report written by economist John Mueller of the Lehrman, Bell, Mueller, Cannon, Inc. market-forecasting firm on behalf of the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare.

It is worth pointing out that this report is not the product of some anti-Wall Street or pro-big government partisan. John Mueller is a conservative, supply-side Republican who served for a number of years as the chief economist for Jack Kemp and the U.S. House Republican caucus.

After putting aside the usual optimistic rhetoric about privatization and actually examining the numbers, here's what John Mueller found:

That Social Security provides a measurably higher real return than all types of financial assets—including the stock market—when traditional calculations of risk are considered. In fact, financial asset returns, under the same economic conditions, are lower than the average return on a steady-state, pay-as-you-go Social Security system.

Social Security will be even more attractive, not less, than private investments in financial assets during the next 75 years, when actuarial projections contend that the U.S. economy is likely to slow to a 1.4 percent growth rate. The same economic and demographic factors that drove average, real stockmarket returns up by 10 percent annually in the past 20 years will drive Wall Street returns down to about 1.5 percent in the next 20 years.

Social Security, by financing a huge investment in human capital, has been an enormous engine for the growth of the U.S. economy. Privatization would result in lower investment, slower growth, and a smaller economy; the loss well could reach $3 trillion and cost the economy at least 4 percent in lost growth during the next 75 years.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to obtain a copy and read John Mueller's report: Three New Papers on "Privatizing" Social Security, One Conclusion: Bad Idea. I would be pleased to provide a copy to any colleague who may be interested.•

HONORING CONGREGATION B'NAI ABRAHAM ON THE OCCASION OF ITS 90TH ANNIVERSARY

• Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I want to offer my congratulations to congregation B'nai Abraham, located in Beloit, WI, as its members mark 90 years of service to the Jewish community in southern Wisconsin.

Mr. President, B'nai Abraham was founded on November 7, 1907, by a group of people who were collecting funds to help a destitute man. It was a highly appropriate beginning to a congregation dedicated to providing comfort, inspiration, solace, guidance, and support. Since then, the members of congregation B'nai Abraham have nurtured a strong sense of community responsibility, and the congregation has embraced the role of the synagogue, as with any house of religious faith, as a shelter and a center for renewal of the spirit.

But faith, like the body that carries it, only grows stronger with exercise, and by that I mean its application in our daily lives. The values I learned in my community, including diligence, compassion a sense of justice and feeling of responsibility to my community, have been cornerstones of my career in public service, and I have tried to apply those values in my work, including my efforts on bipartisan congressional reform, my support of Israel and the Middle East peace process, and my commitment to civil rights.

As with so many other Americans, the people who founded B'nai Abraham came from a culture whose members sought these shores to escape oppression, and they relied on one another for support even as the whole new world of challenge and opportunity spread itself out before them.

Mr. President, I grew up among the members of that community, and I counted on my congregation to provide the grounding in values and traditions every young person needs as he or she is growing up, as well as a sense of spiritual and cultural refreshment. It is particularly important for people of faith who find themselves in the minority to have a place to worship and to pass along their values and traditions to their children.

B'nai Abraham places a very strong emphasis on education, and congregations like B'nai Abraham also serve to represent their members to others and promote the awareness of Jewish heritage in our communities.

In that way, B'nai Abraham's members not only educate their neighbors but also show how people of diverse backgrounds still share experiences, histories and concerns, which can be a powerful encouragement to the continued efforts of so many Americans to promote understanding, tolerance, and cooperation.

Mr. President, I am a member of many communities America, the State of Wisconsin and the town of Middleton, but without this community of faith that has done so much to guide and support me, I would be a poorer man.

So, Mr. President, let me offer my warmest congratulations to congregation B'nai Abraham, and may its members enjoy good health and good fortune as they prepare to celebrate 100 years.•

WIRELESS TELEPHONE PROTECTION ACT

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 167, which is S. 493.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 493) to amend section 1029 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to cellular telephone cloning paraphernalia.

HeinOnline -- 1 Wireless Telephone Protection Act: P.L. 105-172: 112 Stat. 53: April 24, 1998 S12484 1998

S. 830 is not just about the reform or modernization of a Federal agency. The activities of the FDA effect every single one of us, every single day. Whether it is taking an aspirin or brushing our teeth the FDA was involved. It ensured that the aspirin and the toothpaste was safe and effective. The FDA manufacturing standards protect these products so that we can feel confident that they were not contaminated or tampered with prior to our purchase.

The agency is also involved in making sure that new technology to diagnosis or screen for life-threatening illnesses is reliable and that the claims made by the manufacturer are consistent with the available technology. The FDA must also ensure the safety and effectiveness of all drugs as well. When we pick up a prescription like an antibiotic at the pharmacy, we never think twice about the safety or effectiveness of the drug. We simply assume that if taken properly it is safe and effective at treating an ear infection. It is because of the success of the FDA that we do take so much of this for granted.

This is not to say that there have not been problems in the past. But, I believe the changes and improvements made by S. 830 addresses some of these problems and that the commitment made by the chairman to maintain aggressive and effective oversight of the agency will prevent significant problems in the future. I know that there are some who are skeptical of the reforms and modernization called for in this legislation and they point to past problems at the agency as their proof. I am not dismissing past mistakes by the FDA, but I also do not believe we can allow the past errors to paralyze the agency. We have to move toward the future, and learn from the mistakes of the past.

The agency has been given a daunting task with limited resources. However, it has become obvious over the years that a major modernization was necessary in order to keep pace with the rapid changes in drugs and devices and the globalization of the biotech industry. In 1992 the Prescription Drug User Fee Act [PDUFA], the partnership between the agency and the prescription drug industry, was enacted. This major effort has proven to be a major success for the FDA, industry, and patients. I am pleased that we were able to include reauthorization of PDUFA in S. 830 that builds on the success of the 1992 legislation.

I am pleased that we have completed this process and are sending a solid, bipartisan bill to the President for signature. I am confident that enactment of S. 830, FDA Modernization and Accountability Act will prove to be one of the major accomplishments of the 105th Congress. I know that I am proud to have been directly involved in the development of this legislation.

I look forward to working with Chairman JEFFORDS and Senator KENNEDY in the same bipartisan manner as we tackle other public health reform initiatives.●

JONES ACT WAIVER—S. 1349

● Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, today the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation agreed to be discharged from further consideration of S. 1349. The bill would waive the U.S. build and prior U.S. ownership requirements of the coastwise trade laws and allow the ferry *Prince Nova* to be employed in the coastwise trade.

Usually, Jones Act waiver bills such as S. 1349 are first considered by the Commerce Committee, and subsequently included in Coast Guard authorization legislation for final passage. In this case, the Commerce Committee did not have an opportunity to consider S. 1349 during the Committee's last executive session of this year. The Senator from Connecticut, however, requested the opportunity to have the Senate adopt the bill before the end of the first session.

Mr. President, the bill meets the Commerce Committee's usual criteria for adopting such waivers. Senator HOLLINGS, the ranking member of the Commerce Committee, and I agreed to request the Commerce Committee be discharged from further consideration of the bill so that the Senator from Connecticut's request could be accommodated.●

HAWAII'S EXCEPTIONALLY STRONG PATRIOTISM

● Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, the Honolulu Star Bulletin's weekly article, "Hawaii's World," written by one of Hawaii's most respected journalist, A. A. (Bud) Smyser, commemorated Veterans Day with an article entitled, "Hawaii's Exceptionally Strong Patriotism." This article appeared in the Thursday, November 6, 1997 edition. I ask that Mr. Smyser's article be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Honolulu Star Bulletin, Nov. 6, 1997]

HAWAII'S EXCEPTIONALLY STRONG PATRIOTISM

(By A.A. Smyser)

For Veterans Day next Tuesday, I have a message from on high. The Defense Department's top officer in this half of the world calls Hawaii "the most patriotic community I know."

Adm. Joseph W. Prueher said that to a Chamber of Commerce of Hawaii lunch in July. He reiterated it recently when I asked for amplification.

He has been CINPAC (commander-in-chief Pacific) since January 1996, dealt with a lot of community matters, watched the turnouts of political and community leaders for Military Appreciation Week in May (which few if any other communities have), Memorial Day, Independence Day, Veterans Day and Pearl Harbor anniversary events.

He also is fully aware of the World War II contributions of Hawaii's soldiers of Japanese ancestry fighting to prove their loyalty. He is impressed by the still-continuing reunions of those groups with sons and daughters pledged to carry on.

He knows there are scratchy points in military-community relations such as the Makua Valley beach landing exercise, which he called off at the request of Governor Cayetano and leaders of the Leeward Oahu community.

But he has faith the community remains behind the essential use of Hawaii facilities to train fighting forces. He works closely with Sen. Daniel K. Inouye, who says "this community pulls out the stops for the military more than any place I've ever seen."

He's a Navy man, of course, who sees more of our mainland coasts than inland, but his Army deputy, Lt. Gen. Joseph DeFrancisco, concurs. The only place DeFrancisco can think of that comes close to matching us in showing its patriotism is the Gulf Coast area of Georgia around Fort Stewart and Hunter Army Airfield. Our Navy League chapter of 5,000 is the biggest in the U.S.

Servicemen in Hawaii get stickers for their ID cards that entitle them to kamaaina discounts in Waikiki an elsewhere. They also get auto license discounts and reduced tuition at the University of Hawaii.

There's a two-way street, of course. The armed services are among the very best Aloha United Way contributors. They provide emergency medical airlifts and rescues at sea, are prompt with community disaster relief. They have adopted 130 public and private schools for renovation help and grounds cleaning. They recently gave six schools 205 computers.

They host the Special Olympics for children with disabilities, serve as Big Brothers and Big Sisters, help tutor children in all grades, and dig in for projects like litter cleanup around Diamond Head. They co-host Hydrofest, join in community parades and open their bases for visitation. Veterans' medical facilities at Tripler Army Medical Center are first-rate.

Hawaii's high cost of living is a concern for many service people, alleviated by the fact that 78 percent are housed on base. Past criticisms of our schools seem to have eased with more military-community interaction.

Most land use concerns have been quieted by creation of a joint military-civilian task force to review military needs and relinquish unneeded properties.

Makua is the current hot potato. The canceled beach landing would have been a first, but continuing use of the valley itself as a weapons training area remains a high priority need to the military, an intrusion to the civilian critics.

It is the kind of thing the governor and other top civilian officials will have to weigh carefully in light of the $3.4 billion annual military spending here that is based heavily on our year-round training capability for all services.●

MAMMOGRAPHY QUALITY STANDARDS REAUTHORIZATION ACT

● Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I am very pleased that the Senate yesterday passed S. 537, the 5-year reauthorization of the Mammography Quality Standards Act. The original statute, now 5 years old, passed in 1992 with broad bipartisan support. Through the tireless efforts of Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI, the lead sponsor of the Mammography Quality Standards Reauthorization Act, we will be able to continue this critical program for women's health.

Prior to the passage of this legislation, breast tumors in women were often missed because of defective x ray equipment or inadequately trained personnel. Today, to operate lawfully, a mammography facility must be certified as providing quality mammography services. That means that a national uniform quality standard for

HeinOnline -- 1 Wireless Telephone Protection Act: P.L. 105-172: 112 Stat. 53: April 24, 1998 S12483 1998

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Wireless Telephone Protection Act".

SEC. 2. FRAUD AND RELATED ACTIVITY IN CONNECTION WITH COUNTERFEIT ACCESS DEVICES.

(a) UNLAWFUL ACTS.—Section 1029(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (9) as paragraph (10); and

(2) by striking paragraph (8) and inserting the following:

"(8) knowingly and with intent to defraud uses, produces, traffics in, has control or custody of, or possesses a scanning receiver;

"(9) knowingly uses, produces, traffics in, has control or custody of, or possesses hardware or software, knowing it has been configured for altering or modifying a telecommunications instrument so that such instrument may be used to obtain unauthorized access to telecommunications services; or".

(b) PENALTIES.—

(1) GENERALLY.—Section 1029(c) of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) PENALTIES.—The punishment for an offense under subsection (a) section is—

"(1) in the case of an offense that does not occur after a conviction for another offense under this section that has become final and that was committed on a separate prior occasion.

"(A) if the offense is under paragraph (2), (3), (6), (7), or (10) of subsection (a), a fine under this title or imprisonment for not more than 10 years, or both; and

"(B) if the offense is under paragraph (1), (4), (5), (8), or (9), of subsection (a), a fine under this title or imprisonment for not more than 15 years, or both; and

"(2) in the case of an offense that occurs after a conviction for another offense under this section, that has become final and that was committed on a separate prior occasion, that has a fine under this title or imprisonment for not more than 20 years, or both.".

(2) ATTEMPTS.—Section 1029(b)(1) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking "punished as provided in subsection (c) of this section" and inserting "subject to the same penalties as those prescribed for the offense attempted".

(c) DEFINITION OF SCANNING RECEIVER.—Section 1029(e) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (6), by striking "and" at the end;

(2) in paragraph (7)—

(A) by striking "The" and inserting "the"; and

(B) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) in paragraph (8), by striking the period at the end and inserting "or to intercept an electronic serial number, mobile identification number, or other identifier of any telecommunications service, equipment, or instrument; and".

(d) APPLICABILITY OF NEW SECTION 1029(a)(9).—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1029 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(g) It is not a violation of subsection (a)(9) for an officer, employee, or agent of, or a person under contract with, a facilities-based carrier, for the purpose of protecting the property or legal rights of that carrier, to use, produce, have custody or control of, or possess hardware or software configured as described in that subsection (a)(9).".

(2) DEFINITION OF FACILITIES-BASED CARRIER.—Section 1029(e) of title 18, United States Code, as amended by subsection (c) of this section, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(9) the term 'facilities-based carrier' means an entity that owns communications transmission facilities, is responsible for the operation and maintenance of those facilities, and holds an operating license issued by the Federal Communications Commission under the authority of title III of the Communications Act of 1934.".

(e) AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL SENTENCING GUIDELINES FOR WIRELESS TELEPHONE CLONING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Pursuant to its authority under section 994 of title 28, United States Code, the United States Sentencing Commission shall review and amend the Federal sentencing guidelines and the policy statements of the Commission, if appropriate, to provide an appropriate penalty for offenses involving the cloning of wireless telephones (including offenses involving an attempt or conspiracy to clone a wireless telephone).

(2) FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION.—In carrying out this section, the Commission shall consider, with respect to the offenses described in paragraph (1)—

(A) the range of conduct covered by the offenses;

(B) the existing sentence for the offenses;

(C) the extent to which the value of the loss caused by the offenses (as defined in the Federal sentencing guidelines) is an adequate measure for establishing penalties under the Federal sentencing guidelines;

(D) the extent to which sentencing enhancements within the Federal sentencing guidelines and the court's authority to impose a sentence in excess of the applicable guideline range are adequate to ensure punishment at or near the maximum penalty for the most egregious conduct covered by the offenses;

(E) the extent to which the Federal sentencing guideline sentences for the offenses have been constrained by statutory maximum penalties;

(F) the extent to which Federal sentencing guildlines for the offenses adequately achieve the purposes of sentencing set forth in section 3553(a)(2) of title 18, United States Code;

(G) the relationship of Federal sentencing guidelines for the offenses to the Federal sentencing guidelines for other offenses of comparable seriousness; and

(H) any other factor that the Commission consideredS to be appropriate.

AMENDMENT NO. 1634

(Purpose: To make an amendment relating to forfeiture to the United States of any real or personal property used or intended to be used to commit, facilitate, or promote the commission of certain offense.)

Mr. LOTT. Senator HATCH has an amendment at the desk. I ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT], for Mr. HATCH, proposes an amendment numbered 1634.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 6, line 1, strike "The punishment" and insert the following:

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The punishment".

On page 6, line 2, strike "section".

On page 6, line 3, strike "(1)" and insert "(A)" and indent accordingly.

On page 6, line 7, strike "(A)" and insert "(i)" and indent accordingly.

On page 6, line 11, strike "(B)" and insert "(ii)" and indent accordingly.

On page 6, line 14, strike "and".

On page 6, line 15, strike "(2)" and insert "(B)" and indent accordingly.

On page 6, line 19, strike the punctuation at the end and insert "; and".

On page 6, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

"(C) in any case, in addition to any other punishment imposed or any other forfeiture required by law, forfeiture to the United States of any personal property used or intended to be used to commit, facilitate, or promote the commission of the offense.

"(2) APPLICABLE PROCEDURE.—The criminal forfeiture of personal property subject to forfeiture under paragraph (1)(C), any seizure and disposition thereof, and any administrative or judicial proceeding in relation thereto, shall be governed by subsections (c) and (e) through (p) of section 413 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 853).".

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise to urge my colleagues to support S. 493, the Wireless Telephone Protection Act. This important bill will close a glaring gap in the protection afforded by federal law to cellular telephone communications.

Law enforcement is alarmed by the increasingly prevalent practice of "cloning" cellular phones. Essentially, criminals operating scanners from the roadside or from buildings near urban freeways, copy identifying numbers for cellular phones. Using the data they obtain, these criminals alter other phones to access the accounts tied to the phone whose data was scanned, thus creating so-called "clone phones". They then either sell these phones, or use the clone phones themselves for criminal purposes. These phones are used for several weeks or months, until the legitimate customer notices the fraud when he or she gets the bill for phone service accessed by the clone phone.

The effects of these criminal schemes are twofold. First, this crime steals cellular service from the phone companies, which typically credit legitimate customers' accounts when alerted to the fraud. Second, the use of clone phones masks other criminal conduct by making criminal's calls difficult, if not impossible, to trace. S. 493, sponsored by Senator KYL, helps close this gap in the law by making it a federal crime to own or use the software or hardware needed to clone cell phones.

I also urge my colleagues to support an amendment to this bill, to ensure the confiscation of the equipment used to violate this law, and commit other frauds related to access devices. Presently, persons convicted of committing access device fraud under section 1029 of title 18 forfeit to the government the proceeds of their crime. However, there is no provision ensuring that the computers, hardware, software, and other equipment used to commit the crime is forfeited, as well. My amendment to this bill corrects this.

My amendment includes in the penalties for a violation of 18 U.S.C. 1029, the forfeiture of any personal property

HeinOnline -- 1 Wireless Telephone Protection Act: P.L. 105-172: 112 Stat. 53: April 24, 1998 S12485 1998

used to commit, facilitate, or promote the commission of the violation. I note for my colleagues that my amendment only addresses criminal forfeiture, so there must be a conviction for the assets to be seized. Second, my amendment only permits the forfeiture of personal property used to commit the offense—mainly, equipment. Houses, other buildings, or land could not be subject to forfeiture under this provision.

Mr. President, it is important that we close the gaps in the law that permit criminals to brazenly sell and use equipment to steal cellular phone service and evade law enforcement. It is equally important to get this equipment off the streets. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and the underlying bill.

Mr. LOTT. I ask consent that the amendment be considered as read and agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 1634) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1635

(Purpose: To make technical amendments)

Mr. LOTT. I understand Senator KYL has an amendment at the desk. I ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT], for Mr. KYL, proposes an amendment numbered 1635.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 6, line 5, strike "that has become final and that was committed on a separate prior occasion," and inert ", which conviction has become final—".

On page 6, line 7, strike "(2),".

On page 6, line 11, strike "(1)," and insert "(1), (2),".

On page 6, beginning on line 16, strike "that has become final and that was committed on a separate prior occasion, that has" and insert "which conviction has become final,".

On page 7, line 24, after "subsection (a)(9)" insert ", provided that if such hardware or software is used to obtain access to telecommunications service provided by another facilities-based carrier, such access is authorized".

Mr. LOTT. I ask unanimous consent the amendment be considered as read and agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 1635) was agreed to.

Mr. LOTT. I ask unanimous consent the committee amendment, as amended, be agreed to, the bill be considered read a third time and passed as amended, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The bill (S. 493), as amended, was considered read the third time and passed, as follows:

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

S. 493

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Wireless Telephone Protection Act".

SEC. 2. FRAUD AND RELATED ACTIVITY IN CONNECTION WITH COUNTERFEIT ACCESS DEVICES.

(a) UNLAWFUL ACTS.—Section 1029(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (9) as paragraph (10); and

(2) by striking paragraph (8) and inserting the following:

"(8) knowingly and with intent to defraud uses, produces, traffics in, has control or custody of, or possesses a scanning receiver;

"(9) knowingly uses, produces, traffics in, has control or custody of, or possesses hardware or software, knowing it has been configured for altering or modifying a telecommunications instrument so that such instrument may be used to obtain unauthorized access to telecommunications services; or".

(b) PENALTIES.—

(1) GENERALLY.—Section 1029(c) of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) PENALTIES.—(1) IN GENERAL.—The punishment for an offense under subsection (a) is—

"(A) in the case of an offense that does not occur after a conviction for another offense under this section, which conviction has become final—

"(i) if the offense is under paragraph (3), (6), (7), or (10) of subsection (a), a fine under this title or imprisonment for not more than 10 years, or both; and

"(ii) if the offense is under paragraph (1), (2), (4), (5), (8), or (9), of subsection (a), a fine under this title or imprisonment for not more than 15 years, or both;

"(B) in the case of an offense that occurs after a conviction for another offense under this section, which conviction has become final, a fine under this title or imprisonment for not more than 20 years, or both; and

"(C) in any case, in addition to any other punishment imposed or any other forfeiture required by law, forfeiture to the United States of any personal property used or intended to be used to commit, facilitate, or promote the commission of the offense.

"(2) APPLICABLE PROCEDURE.—The criminal forfeiture of personal property subject to forfeiture under paragraph (1)(C), any seizure and disposition thereof, and any administrative or judicial proceeding in relation thereto, shall be governed by subsections (c) and (e) through (p) of section 413 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 853).".

(2) ATTEMPTS.—Section 1029(b)(1) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking "punished as provided in subsection (c) of this section" and inserting "subject to the same penalties as those prescribed for the offense attempted".

(c) DEFINITION OF SCANNING RECEIVER.—Section 1029(e) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (6), by striking "and" at the end;

(2) in paragraph (7)—

(A) by striking "The" and inserting "the"; and

(B) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) in paragraph (8), by striking the period at the end and inserting "or to intercept an electronic serial number, mobile identification number, or other identifier of any telecommunications service, equipment, or instrument; and".

(d) APPLICABILITY OF NEW SECTION 1029(a)(9).—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1029 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(g) It is not a violation of subsection (a)(9) for an officer, employee, or agent of, or a person under contract with, a facilities-based carrier, for the purpose of protecting the property or legal rights of that carrier, to use, produce, have custody or control of, or possess hardware or software configured as described in that subsection (a)(9): *Provided*, That if such hardware or software is used to obtain access to telecommunications service provided by another facilities-based carrier, such access is authorized.".

(2) DEFINITION OF FACILITIES-BASED CARRIER.—Section 1029(e) of title 18, United States Code, as amended by subsection (c) of this section, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(9) the term 'facilities-based carrier' means an entity that owns communications transmission facilities, is responsible for the operation and maintenance of those facilities, and holds an operating license issued by the Federal Communications Commission under the authority of title III of the Communications Act of 1934.".

(e) AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL SENTENCING GUIDELINES FOR WIRELESS TELEPHONE CLONING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Pursuant to its authority under section 994 of title 28, United States Code, the United States Sentencing Commission shall review and amend the Federal sentencing guidelines and the policy statements of the Commission, if appropriate, to provide an appropriate penalty for offenses involving the cloning of wireless telephones (including offenses involving an attempt or conspiracy to clone a wireless telephone).

(2) FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION.—In carrying out this subsection, the Commission shall consider, with respect to the offenses described in paragraph (1)—

(A) the range of conduct covered by the offenses;

(B) the existing sentences for the offenses;

(C) the extent to which the value of the loss caused by the offenses (as defined in the Federal sentencing guidelines) is an adequate measure for establishing penalties under the Federal sentencing guidelines;

(D) the extent to which sentencing enhancements within the Federal sentencing guidelines and the court's authority to impose a sentence in excess of the applicable guideline range are adequate to ensure punishment at or near the maximum penalty for the most egregious conduct covered by the offenses;

(E) the extent to which the Federal sentencing guideline sentences for the offenses have been constrained by statutory maximum penalties;

(F) the extent to which Federal sentencing guidelines for the offenses adequately achieve the purposes of sentencing set forth in section 3553(a)(2) of title 18, United States Code;

(G) the relationship of Federal sentencing guidelines for the offenses to the Federal sentencing guidelines for other offenses of comparable seriousness; and

(H) any other factors that the Commission considers to be appropriate.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I am gratified that S. 493, the Cellular Telephone Protection Act, which would make it easier for Federal law enforcement to stop cell phone cloning, has unanimously been approved by the Senate. I expect that the bill will soon pass the House of Representatives, and be

HeinOnline -- 1 Wireless Telephone Protection Act: P.L. 105-172: 112 Stat. 53: April 24, 1998 S12486 1998

signed into law by the President. S. 493 is the first in a series of anticrime initiatives I introduced that are aimed at modernizing U.S. law to reflect changes in technology.

It is estimated that the cellular telecommunications industry lost $650 million due to fraud in 1995, much of it as a result of cloning. Cloned phones are popular among the most vicious criminal element. The feature story from the July/August edition of Time Digital, "Lethal Weapon: How Your Cell Phone Became Gangland's Favorite Gadget" quotes James Kallstrom, head of the FBI's New York office as describing cloners as "hard-core criminals, child pornographers and pedophiles * * * violent criminals who use technology to avoid the law."

On September 11, Representative BILL MCCOLLUM, chairman of the House Judiciary Crime Subcommittee, held a very useful hearing on cellular phone cloning. The hearing discussed legislative proposals to combat cellular phone fraud. Representatives of the Secret Service, FBI, and DEA all testified that legislation resembling S. 493 would be helpful in thwarting cell phone cloning.

The hearing revealed that cloned phones have become a staple of the major drug trafficking organizations. Anthony R. Bocchichio, of the DEA stated that, "[International drug trafficking organizations] utilize their virtually unlimited wealth to purchase the most sophisticated electronic equipment available on the market to facilitate their illegal activities. We have begun to see that this includes widespread use of cloned cellular telephones."

The Secret Service—the Federal agency charged with investigating cloning offenses—has doubled the number of arrests in the area of wireless telecommunications fraud every year since 1991, with 800 individuals charged for their part in the cloning of cellular phones last year. While the cell phone law (18 U.S.C. 1029) has been useful in prosecuting some cloners, the statute has not functioned well in stopping those who manufacture and distribute cloning devices.

In testimony before Mr. MCCOLLUM's Crime Subcommittee, Michael C. Stenger of the U.S. Secret Service stressed the need to revise our current cell phone statute:

> Due to the fact that the statute presently requires the proof of "intent to defraud" to charge the violation, the distributors of the cloning equipment have become elusive targets. These distributors utilize disclaimers in their advertising mechanisms aimed at avoiding a finding of fraudulent intent. This allows for the continued distribution of the equipment permitting all elements of the criminal arena to equip themselves with free, anonymous phone service.

Consistent with Mr. Stenger's recommendation, the Cellular Telephone Protection Act provides that—except for law enforcement and telecommunications carriers—there is no lawful purpose for which to possess, produce, or sell the "copycat boxes" for cloning a wireless telephone or its electronic serial number.

For S. 493 to apply, a prosecutor would need to prove that an individual "knowingly uses, produces, traffics in, has control or custody of, or possesses hardware or software, knowing it has been configured for altering or modifying a telecommunications instrument so that such instrument may be used to obtain unauthorized access to telecommunications services." Someone who does not know that a telecommunications device has been altered to modify a telecommunications instrument would not be criminally liable under this section.

To be clear, except for law enforcement and telecommunication carriers, there is no legitimate purpose for which to possess equipment used to modify cellular phones. Representatives from the Secret Service, DEA, and FBI testified to this point at the cellular fraud hearing. As Special Agent Stenger put it, "There is no legitimate use for the equipment such as that designed to alter the electronic serial numbers in wireless telephones."

The removal of the "intent to defraud" language in 18 U.S.C. 1029 only applies to the possession and use of the hardware and software configured to alter telecommunications instruments. This narrowly targeted proposal does not apply to those who are in the possession of cloned phones. Nor does it apply to those in the possession of scanning receivers, which do have some legitimate uses.

The Senate bill enjoys broad bipartisan support. Senators CLELAND, DEWINE, DORGAN, DURBIN, GORTON, HELMS, LOTT, MIKULSKI, and THURMOND have cosponsored S. 493. And a bipartisan House companion bill (H.R. 2460) has been introduced by Representatives SAM JOHNSON, BILL MCCOLLUM, and CHARLES SCHUMER.

I am hopeful that my colleagues will join in supporting this important piece of legislation.

LAW ENFORCEMENT TECHNOLOGY ADVERTISEMENT CLARIFICATION ACT OF 1997

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1840 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

> A bill (H.R. 1840) to provide a law enforcement exception to the prohibition on the advertising of certain electronic devices.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the bill be considered read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 1840) was considered read the third time and passed.

ALLOWING REVISION OF VETERANS BENEFITS DECISIONS BASED ON CLEAR AND UNMISTAKABLE ERROR

Mr. LOTT. I ask unanimous consent that the Veterans Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1090, and, further, the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

> A bill (H.R. 1090) to amend title 38, United States Code, to allow the revision of Veterans benefits decisions based on clear and unmistakable error.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise to encourage the Senate to adopt H.R. 1090. This legislation is identical to my bill, S. 464, to address the issue of clear and unmistakable error. S. 464 was unanimously reported by the Veterans' Affairs Committee on which I proudly serve. I want to extend my thanks to both the chairman and ranking member of our committee for moving this important legislation in a timely and bipartisan manner .

Importantly, this legislation has been adopted by the House in three consecutive Congresses. Congressman LANE EVANS has long championed this legislation; I commend him for his persistent and determined leadership. This legislation has also long been a priority issue to the Disabled American Vetetans. It has been a pleasure for me to work with the DAV here in Washington, DC and with local DAV representatives in Washington State.

Clear and unmistakable errors are errors that have deprived and continue to deprive veterans of benefits for which their entitlement is undeniable. The status quo denies benefits to a small number of veterans who are legally entitled to the benefits in question. To deny a veteran a legally entitled benefit due to a bureaucratic error or other mistake is beyond comprehension in my mind.

In recent months, I've handled several cases with the Department of Veterans Affairs that directly involved clear and unmistakable error. In one case, a veteran with a serious shoulder injury dating back to the Vietnam war was rated incorrectly for more than 20 years. In another case, a veteran with PTSD also dating to service in Vietnam was misdiagnosed for a lengthy period affecting his disability rating and benefits and the treatment he received. My legislation seeks to correct

HeinOnline -- 1 Wireless Telephone Protection Act: P.L. 105-172: 112 Stat. 53: April 24, 1998 S12487 1998

this. I believe that we must make available every opportunity to right a wrong on behalf of a veteran.

To the VA's credit, some cases of clear and unmistakable error are reversible but it depends on where the veteran is in the VA process. S. 464 and H.R. 1090 will codify the VA's current regulatory authority to review ratings decision based on claim of clear and unmistakable error.

Unfortunately, some cases of clear and unmistakable error no longer offer recourse to the veteran. S. 464 and H.R. 1090 will allow a veteran to request that the Board of Veterans' Appeals review its prior decision based on a claim of clear and unmistakable error. A veteran would also have the opportunity to challenge the Board of Veterans' Appeals decision at the Court of Veterans' Appeals.

The Congressional Budget Office has determined that this legislation is budget neutral. This legislation will not require additional resources for the VA or take needed resources from other VA programs or benefits.

So often we in Congress talk about providing for veterans or about meeting our obligations to veterans. That is what this bill is all about; it gives a veteran the right to request a review rather than subjecting an ailing vet to a sometimes faceless bureaucracy hesitant to correct its mistakes. In passing this legislation, the Senate will stand with veterans that have been deprived of benefits for which their entitlement is undeniable.

Many veterans have waited decades for this day. The Senate should end this wait now with a strong vote. A strong vote will also send a message to President Clinton. In closing, I call upon President Clinton to bring this legislative effort to a successful conclusion; to join us all to ensure that the system errs on behalf of a deserving veteran rather than the Federal Government.

Mr. LOTT. I ask unanimous consent the bill be considered read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 1090) was considered read the third time and passed.

VETERANS' BENEFITS DENIAL ACT OF 1997

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on (S. 923) to deny veterans benefits to persons convicted of Federal capital offenses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the bill from the Senate (S. 923) entitled "An Act to deny veterans benefits to persons convicted of Federal capital offenses.", do pass with the following amendments:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. DENIAL OF ELIGIBILITY FOR INTERMENT OR MEMORIALIZATION IN CERTAIN CEMETERIES OF PERSONS COMMITTING FEDERAL CAPITAL CRIMES.

(a) PROHIBITION AGAINST INTERMENT OR MEMORIALIZATION IN CERTAIN FEDERAL CEMETERIES.—Chapter 24 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"§2411. Prohibition against interment or memorialization in the National Cemetery System or Arlington National Cemetery of persons committing Federal or State capital crimes

"(a)(1) In the case of a person described in subsection (b), the appropriate Federal official may not—

"(A) inter the remains of such person in a cemetery in the National Cemetery System or in Arlington National Cemetery; or

"(B) honor the memory of such person in a memorial area in a cemetery in the National Cemetery System (described in section 2403(a) of this title) or in such an area in Arlington National Cemetery (described in section 2409(a) of this title).

"(2) The prohibition under paragraph (1) shall not apply unless written notice of a conviction or finding under subsection (b) is received by the appropriate Federal official before such official approves an application for the interment or memorialization of such person. Such written notice shall be furnished to such official by the Attorney General, in the case of a Federal capital crime, or by an appropriate State official, in the case of a State capital crime.

"(b) A person referred to in subsection (a) is any of the following:

"(1) A person who has been convicted of a Federal capital crime for which the person was sentenced to death or life imprisonment.

"(2) A person who has been convicted of a State capital crime for which the person was sentenced to death or life imprisonment without parole.

"(3) A person who—

"(A) is found (as provided in subsection (c)) to have committed a Federal capital crime or a State capital crime, but

"(B) has not been convicted of such crime by reason of such person not being available for trial due to death or flight to avoid prosecution.

"(c) A finding under subsection (b)(3) shall be made by the appropriate Federal official. Any such finding may only be made based upon a showing of clear and convincing evidence, after an opportunity for a hearing in a manner prescribed by the appropriate Federal official.

"(d) For purposes of this section:

"(1) The term 'Federal capital crime' means an offense under Federal law for which the death penalty or life imprisonment may be imposed.

"(2) The term 'State capital crime' means, under State law, the willful, deliberate, or premeditated unlawful killing of another human being for which the death penalty or life imprisonment without parole may be imposed.

"(3) The term 'appropriate Federal official' means—

"(A) the Secretary, in the case of the National Cemetery System; and

"(B) the Secretary of the Army, in the case of Arlington National Cemetery.".

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 24 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

"2411. Prohibition against interment or memorialization in the National Cemetery System or Arlington National Cemetery of persons committing Federal or State capital crimes.".

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 2411 of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall apply with respect to applications for interment or memorialization made on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 2. CONDITION ON GRANTS TO STATE-OWNED VETERAN CEMETERIES.

Section 2408 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

"(d)(1) In addition to the conditions specified in subsections (b) and (c), any grant made on or after the date of the enactment of this subsection to a State under this section to assist such State in establishing, expanding, or improving a veterans' cemetery shall be made on the condition described in paragraph (2).

"(2) For purposes of paragraph (1), the condition described in this paragraph is that, after the date of the receipt of the grant, such State prohibit the interment or memorialization in that cemetery of a person described in section 2411(b) of this title, subject to the receipt of notice described in subsection (a)(2) of such section, except that for purposes of this subsection—

"(A) such notice shall be furnished to an appropriate official of such State; and

"(B) a finding described in subsection (b)(3) of such section shall be made by an appropriate official of such State.".

Amend the title so as to read "An Act to amend title 38, United States Code, to prohibit interment or memorialization in certain cemeteries of persons committing Federal or State capital crimes.".

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on the bill (S. 714) to extend and improve the Native American Veteran Housing Loan Pilot Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to extend certain authorities of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs relating to services for homeless veterans, to extend certain other authorities of the Secretary, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the bill from the Senate (S. 714) entitled "An Act to extend and improve the Native American Veteran Housing Loan Pilot Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to extend certain authorities of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs relating to services for homeless veterans, to extend certain other authorities of the Secretary, and for other purposes.", do pass with the following amendments:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Veterans' Benefits Act of 1997".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. References to title 38, United States Code.

TITLE I—EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY PROCESS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Sec. 101. Equal employment responsibilities.
Sec. 102. Discrimination complaint adjudication authority.

HeinOnline -- 1 Wireless Telephone Protection Act: P.L. 105-172: 112 Stat. 53: April 24, 1998 [i] 1998

HeinOnline -- 1 Wireless Telephone Protection Act: P.L. 105-172: 112 Stat. 53: April 24, 1998 [ii] 1998