HEINONLINE

Citation: 4 Bernard D. Reams Jr. Law of E-SIGN A Legislative of the Electronic Signatures in Global and National Act Public Law No. 106-229 2000 0 2002

Content downloaded/printed from HeinOnline (http://heinonline.org) Sun Apr 21 21:37:02 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.

the most majestic and deliberative institutions of our Government. Why should our constituents not be allowed access to those institutions?

Look across the street any day that the Supreme Court is in session. Hundreds, sometimes thousands, of Americans amass hoping to be lucky enough to gain admittance to an argument before our Nation's highest court. Some are tourists, visiting the Nation's capital. Some are students on a school trip. All will see the impressive building that houses the Court, but most will not see the actual proceedings that occur inside.

Why should the American people be kept in the dark? Why should they be forced to rely on the news media to interpret and filter the proceedings when, if cameras were allowed, they could watch it for themselves? As Judge Robert Bork has written, "There is often great value in the public seeing the reality of the legal system or of a particular case rather than being left with unchallenged myth and media distortions. The courts are a public institution * * *". The public needs to know that our judicial system is strong, stable and trustworthy.

Another benefit of cameras is the effect that they will have on curbing judicial activism. Federal judges are appointed to interpret the laws set forth by the Constitution of the United States. Unfortunately, there seems to be a disturbing trend in the judicial system. Some judges have reached far beyond their Constitutional authority in recent years and begun to make their own laws. They seem to thrive on twisting the laws passed by Congress, and the Constitution, ignoring its plain meaning and in some cases extrapolating new doctrines. We need to hold judges accountable for their actions and decisions in our courtrooms. One of the best ways to do this is to keep the judicial system under the scrutiny of the public eye. We, all of us, as citizens and particularly as lawmakers have the absolute responsibility to ensure that the balance of powers is being respected by the third branch just as they scrutinize Congress and the executive branch.

From civil rights to religious rights to property rights, to domestic tranquillity, the decisions of our Federal courts impact our constituents, shaping their lives and their liberties. Out constituents are able to watch C–SPAN to observe how these laws are formulated; they should be able to see how they are interpreted, as well.

I would also like to address a concern of open courtroom opponents by entering into the RECORD an excerpt of a letter I recently received from Fred Goldman, father of murder victim Ron Goldman. "The courts belong to the people and the public must have the right to see the process for themselves. Sometimes the system works and sometimes it does not. In either case, the public should have the ability to see for itself. Camera opponents love to argue that the camera's presence in the criminal trial of Ron's killer was somehow to blame for his acquittal. I know this is a popular argument, so I want to state clearly and for the record that I think this is wrong. We sat in the courtroom throughout the trial and we know the camera was not to blame."

Fred Goldman has endorsed the Sunshine in the Courtroom Act and I want to thank him for his support.

It also is important to remember that H.R. 1280 does not force Federal judges to admit cameras in every Federal court case regardless of circumstance. Instead, this legislation grants the presiding judge the power to decide in each specific case whether he or she will allow cameras in the courtroom. This allows judges to protect those who need the privacy of a closed courtroom, such as children, victims of sexual assault, and other sensitive cases in which the identity of those involved in the trial need to remain confidential or where there is reasonable concern or disruption.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, 48 States have found that cameras work in their courtrooms. In my own State of Ohio, for example, Chief Justice Moyer has been at the forefront of pushing for camera access. In his words, "* * * our opportunities to educate the public about the nature of our work are greatly enhanced by television. Given the technological advances of video equipment and satellite communications, we now have the emergence of Court TV * * * we long ago established the principle of open courtrooms with trials in full public view. Cameras are simply the logical progression of the tradition. If we are truly sincere about our efforts and desire to make the public more aware about the work and role of our courts, cameras must be a part of the process."

Mr. Speaker, this Congress must commit itself to passing H.R. 1280 into law next session. Parts of this important legislation have already moved through Subcommittee, and I will be working hard to ensure that the bill continues to move forward, either as part of other legislation or as a stand alone bill. I continue to believe, along with many of my distinguished colleagues from both sides of the aisle, that cameras in Federal courts is key to the judicial branch being accountable and accessible to the American public.

The Sunshine in the Courtroom Act works to keep the American people informed about their Government, a government supported with their tax dollars. It is time to bring sunshine into our Federal courts. We have waited long enough.

THE SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFIT RESTORATION ACT

HON. MAX SANDLIN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1997

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation addressing a serious issue for retired teachers and government employees across America. These public servants, after a lifetime of educating our youth and working for the taxpayers of America, find that their reward is a significant reduction in their Social Security benefits. It is time to end this penalty and give these retirees the benefits they are due.

Retirees drawing a benefit from a private pension fund do not have their Social Security benefits reduced. Why should we do this to civil servants? We should be encouraging able and intelligent people to teach our children and work for the government, not discouraging them by slashing their retirement benefits. We must bring equity to the Social Security benefits of private sector and public sector retirees.

This legislation, the Social Security Benefit Restoration Act, will bring this equity to retirement benefits. This bill will simply eliminate the public sector benefit penalty enacted in 1983 and allow all civil servants to draw full Social Security benefits.

I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this legislation. For every retired government employee and retired teacher in your district experiencing reduced Social Security benefits, I urge your support for this bill.

20TH ANNIVERSARY OF LATINO YOUTH DEVELOPMENT, INC.

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1997

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to recognize the 20th anniversary of Latino Youth Development [LYD], Inc., on Friday, November 21, 1997. That evening, LYD is celebrating this milestone with a special dinner in New Haven, CN.

LYD began in 1977 as a small youth program called Puerto Rican Youth Services. Now, 20 years later, LYD is widely considered the premier organization serving Latino youth in the city of New Haven.

Latino Youth Development, Inc. plays a unique role in the New Haven community by reaching out to and serving as a support system for Latino youth and their families. LYD provides educational, social, cultural, and recreational programs to the Latino community in New Haven.

I come from a family of immigrants. I am a first generation Italian on my father's side and a second generation Italian on my mother's side. So, I have some personal experience with the challenges immigrants face in this country. The barriers of language and the prejudices of some members of the community can be discouraging to someone just trying to find a way to raise a family and make ends meet. I wholeheartedly support efforts to assist and support working families, and I find the efforts of LYD to provide educational and employment opportunities to the Latino community particularly commendable.

I would also like to personally commend the four individuals being honored at the LYD dinner: Andrea Jackson-Brooks, a longtime member and personal friend; Dennis Hart, director of the organization for 7 years; Judith Baldwin, who has been instrumental in assisting the agency in adult programming; and Alderman Jorge Perez, who represents the Hill area of New Haven where LYD is located.

I share LYD's goal of seeing Latino members of our community prosper and become productive citizens of our community, able to assist others in positive development. I congratulate LYD on its 20th anniversary and I wish its members the best of luck in all their future endeavors.

ON LIFTING THE ENCRYPTION EXPORT BAN

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1997

Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about an issue that is very important to me—lifting unfair export controls on encryption technology.

HeinOnline -- 4 Bernard D. Reams, Jr., Law of E-SIGN: A Legislative History of the Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act, Public Law No. 106-229 (2000) 0 2002

Mr. Speaker, protecting our National Security interests is among my highest priorities. If I thought controlling encryption exports worked toward this end, I would be its strongest proponent. Unfortunately, export controls on encryption software simply disadvantage the United States software industry.

Under current law the United States allows only 40 bit encryption codes to be exported, although software companies sell encryption codes of up to 128 bits everywhere in the United States. Forty bit encryption technology is so elementary, it took a graduate student a mere 3½ hours to break a code last January. Fifty-six bit encryption is 65,000 times more difficult to decode than 10 bit encryption and it only took students three months to break the encryption code. One hundred twenty eight bit encryption has not been broken yet.

Naturally, foreign companies do not want to buy 40 bit encryption software, because it is so vulnerable and insecure. The possibilities for "computer hackers" to break into the system and wreak havoc are enormous and dangerous. Therefore, foreign companies are purchasing high-level encryption from foreign software providers instead of American ones.

The international demand for encryption software is growing exponentially because of the tremendous rise in electronic commerce. For instance, German Economics Minister, Guenter Rexrodt, said, "Users can only protect themselves against having data manipulated, destroyed, or spied on by strong encryption procedures * * *. That is why we have to use all of our powers to promote such procedures instead of blocking them."

Our export restraint has not kept the technology from proliferating. It has merely allowed foreign producers of strong encryption technology to fill the vacuum. In fact, American companies are partnering with foreign firms to distribute their software—taking jobs and revenue with them.

American-owned Sun Computers has recently joined with a Russian software company to avoid the U.S. export ban and sell to foreign markets. Foreign companies can also purchase American-produced 40 bit encryption technology and upgrade it in their own countries to 128 bit encryption technology. This "add-on" industry is among the fastest growing software industries in Europe today. Clearly, if someone wants high-level encryption technology, he or she can easily obtain it.

The ability to obtain both powerful and affordable encryption will now become easier with recent developments in Canada. The Canadian Government includes encryption software in decontrolling mass market software under the Generic Software Note. This means any software sold over-the-counter, by mail or on the phone may be exported without limits. Entrust, a Canadian software company, is freely marketing and selling internationally a 128 bit encryption program right now. It sells for less than $50, and Entrust provides a version of the encryption technology free on the Internet. Even our most steadfast ally sees that export controls can no longer help stem the overwhelming demand and spread of unbreakable encryption.

Mr. Speaker, if the United States continues to impose these restrictive export bans on its own companies, "foreign competition could emerge at a level significant enough to damage the present U.S. world leadership" in the software industry, according to the National Research Council's blue-ribbon panel on encryption policy. If our export ban continues, the United States will not be the worldwide leader on encryption technology for long, and that would be a true risk to our national security.

I strongly oppose any unilateral sanctions or regulations that put the United States at an unnecessary disadvantage. Our current export ban on encryption software is a perfect example, and I intend to continue the fight to change our policy and allow the United States to compete in the global software market.

HUNTER SCOTT VINDICATES CAPTAIN McVAY

HON. JOE SCARBOROUGH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1997

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of my colleagues to the work of 12-year-old Hunter Scott, from my hometown of Pensacola, FL. Hunter was recently featured on the NBC Nightly News "American Spirit" segment for his work in vindicating Captain McVay, skipper of the U.S.S. *Indianapolis*.

Captain McVay was commander of the World War II heavy cruiser, the U.S.S. *Indianapolis*. On July 30, 1945, after delivering the atom bomb to the *Enola Gay* on the Pacific Island of Tinian, the U.S.S. *Indianapolis* was torpedoed by the Japanese sub I–58, and sank in 12 minutes. The first torpedo knocked out all power, the SOS was ignored. Since arrivals of combat ships were not then reported, no one knew the ship was sunk. Of the 1,196 men aboard, 300 went down with the ship. After 4½ days without food or water, they were discovered by chance. Only 316 survived the shark attacks in the Philippine Sea.

McVay was court-martialed and convicted on a micro-technicality, making him the only skipper in history court-martialed for losing his ship in combat. Survivors felt their captain was a scapegoat and, with the McVay family, have tried unsuccessfully to vindicate him for years. Captain McVay committed suicide in 1968, and the guilty verdict still stands.

One year ago, Hunter saw the movie "Jaws," and was so taken by Captain Quint's soliloquy on his hatred of sharks due to being a shark bitten *Indy* survivor, he decided to find out more. He placed an ad in a military based newspaper at Pensacola Naval Air Station, searching for survivors. He discovered 80 survivors, and became aware of five books and documentaries highlighting Captain McVay. Hunter took the extraordinary step of interviewing survivors, examining documentary evidence and beginning his personal mission to search out the truth.

Hunter Scott, who now aspires to be a Navy Blue Angel, explains that the action taken against Captain McVay was misguided. He has focused a tremendous amount of effort and energy on clearing the good captain's name.

Hunter has requested Congress' support his efforts to expunge the court-martial from Captain McVay's record. I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting the efforts of this tremendous young man.

An even greater wish of mine is that Hunter Scott's example of courage and diligence in seeking the truth will be followed not only by his peers but also by adults inside Congress and across America.

REMEMBERING THAT FREEDOM COMES AT A PRICE

HON. JERRY MORAN

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1997

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday, Veterans Day, millions of Americans were afforded the opportunity to remember and express our sincere gratitude to those who have served in defense of our Nation.

It was a day to honor great sacrifices, celebrate heroic victories, and to renew their commitments to our Nation's Veterans.

"With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow, and his orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just, and lasting peace, among ourselves, and with all nations."

These words are taken from President Abraham Lincoln's second inaugural address and sadly read again just two months later over its author's grave. The excerpt "to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow, and his orphan," now lays etched in stone on the plaque of the Veterans Administration building in Washington reminding us of the debt we owe to those who have defended our land in times of both war and peace.

On Veterans Day we honor those individuals who set their own aspirations aside to serve their country in defense of freedom and liberty. Our duty is not only to ensure that wreaths are placed on the graves of those who paid the ultimate sacrifice, nor is it only to fly our nation's flag in honor and support of current service members; it is our duty to care for the soldier and his dependents who continue to bear the effects of battle.

In our history, more than one million American men and women have died in defense of our nation. If these now-silent patriot's have taught us anything, it is that because of the men and women who were willing to sacrifice their last blood and breath, the United States remains a symbol of freedom and a country whose ideas are still worth defending.

Veterans Day is a day of national respect. We should not forget those who have allowed us to enjoy that which we have today. More than ever, we must rededicate ourselves to honor the lives and memory of those who served, fought, and often died.

How might we best recognized these American heroes? We should pause to give them thanks for safeguarding our liberties. We should pledge to carry out the civic responsibilities of citizens living in a free country. And we should exercise those loyalties by demonstrating our respect for both our living Veterans and those in their final resting places. It is so little to ask of us when they have given so much.

Veterans are the unsung heroes who define our American heritage, ordinary citizens who did their duty. And to those who have fallen, let us remember that freedom is never free

HeinOnline -- 4 Bernard D. Reams, Jr., Law of E-SIGN: A Legislative History of the Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act, Public Law No. 106-229 (2000) 0 2002

HeinOnline -- 4 Bernard D. Reams, Jr., Law of E-SIGN: A Legislative History of the Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act, Public Law No. 106-229 (2000) 0 2002

Document No. 70

HeinOnline -- 4 Bernard D. Reams, Jr., Law of E-SIGN: A Legislative History of the Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act, Public Law No. 106-229 (2000) [i] 2002

HeinOnline -- 4 Bernard D. Reams, Jr., Law of E-SIGN: A Legislative History of the Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act, Public Law No. 106-229 (2000) [ii] 2002