

session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 15 at 2:30 p.m. The purpose of the hearing is to review the progress made on the development of interim and long-term plans for use of fire retardant aircraft in Federal wildfire suppression operations.

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

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that floor privileges be granted, during the consideration of S. 2271, H.R. 3199, to Bob Schiff, Lara Flynt, Paul Weinberger, Mary Irvine, and Sumner Slichter.

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

STOP COUNTERFEITING IN MANUFACTURED GOODS ACT

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 32 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 32) to amend title 18 United States Code, to provide criminal penalties for trafficking in counterfeit marks.

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

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I want to take a moment to speak about H.R. 32, the Stop Counterfeiting in Manufactured Goods Act of 2005, sponsored by Representative KNOLLENBERG and 59 House cosponsors. The counterfeiting of goods bearing American held trademarks is an important problem that I am committed to fighting, as reflected by my sponsoring S. 1699, the Senate companion bill to H.R. 32, earlier this year with Senator LEAHY and Senators ALEXANDER, BAYH, BROWNBACK, COBURN, CORNYN, DEWINE, DURBIN, FEINGOLD, FEINSTEIN, HATCH, KYL, LEVIN, REED, STABENOW, and VOINOVICH.

H.R. 32, the Stop Counterfeiting in Manufactured Goods Act of 2005 addresses a problem that has reached epidemic proportions as a result of a loophole in our criminal code: the trafficking in counterfeit labels. Criminal law currently prohibits the trafficking in counterfeit trademarks "on or in connection with goods or services." However, it does not prohibit the trafficking in the counterfeit marks themselves. As such, there is nothing in current law to prohibit an individual from selling counterfeit labels bearing otherwise protected trademarks within the United States.

This loophole was exposed by the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals in *United States v. Giles*, 213 F.3d 1247 (10th

Cir. 2000). In this case, the United States prosecuted the defendant for manufacturing and selling counterfeit Dooney & Bourke labels that third parties could later affix to generic purses. Examining title 18, section 2320, of the United States Code, the Tenth Circuit held that persons who sell counterfeit trademarks that are not actually attached to any "goods or services" do not violate the Federal criminal trademark infringement statute. Since the defendant did not attach counterfeit marks to "goods or services," the court found that the defendant did not run afoul of the criminal statute as a matter of law. Thus, someone caught red-handed with counterfeit trademarks walked free.

H.R. 32 closes this loophole by amending title 18, section 2320 of the United States Code to criminally prohibit the trafficking, or attempt to traffic, in "labels, patches, stickers" and generally any item to which a counterfeit mark has been applied. In so doing, H.R. 32 provides U.S. Department of Justice prosecutors with the means not only to prosecute individuals trafficking in counterfeit goods or services, but also individuals trafficking in labels, patches, and the like that are later applied to goods.

Congress must act expeditiously to protect U.S. held trademarks to the fullest extent of the law. The recent 10-count indictment of four Massachusetts residents of conspiracy to traffic in approximately \$1.4 million of counterfeit luxury goods in the case of *U.S. v. Luong et al.*, 2005 D. Mass. underscores the need for this legislation. According to the indictment, law enforcement officers raided self-storage units earlier this year and found the units to hold approximately 12,231 counterfeit handbags; 7,651 counterfeit wallets; more than 17,000 generic handbags and wallets; and enough counterfeit labels and medallions to turn more than 50,000 generic handbags and wallets into counterfeits. Although the U.S. Attorney's Office was able to pursue charges of trafficking and attempting to traffic in counterfeit handbags and wallets, they were not able to bring charges for trafficking and attempting to traffic in the more than 50,000 counterfeit labels and medallions. As such, these defendants will escape prosecution that would have otherwise been illegal if they had only been attached to an otherwise generic bag. This simply does not make sense. Had the Stop Counterfeiting in Manufactured Goods Act of 2005 been in effect at the time of indictment, U.S. prosecutors would have been able to bring charges against the defendants for trafficking and attempting to traffic in not only counterfeit goods, but also counterfeit labels.

As Assistant Attorney General Alice Fisher said:

Those who manufacture and sell counterfeit goods steal business from honest mer-

chants, confuse or defraud honest consumers, and illegally profit on the backs of honest American workers and entrepreneurs.

This point is underscored by the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection estimate that trafficking in counterfeit goods costs the United States approximately \$200 to \$250 million annually. With each passing year, the United States loses millions of dollars in tax revenues to the sale of counterfeit goods. Further, each counterfeit item that is manufactured overseas and distributed in the United States costs American workers tens of thousands of jobs. With counterfeit goods making up a growing 5 to 7 percent of world trade, this is a problem that we can no longer ignore.

To be sure, counterfeiting is not limited to the popular designer goods that we have all seen sold on corners of just about every major metropolitan city in the United States. Counterfeiting has a devastating impact on a broad range of industries. In fact, for almost every legitimate product manufactured and sold within the United States, there is a parallel counterfeit product being sold for no more than half the price. These counterfeit products range from children's toys to clothing to Christmas tree lights. More frightening are the thousands of counterfeit automobile parts, batteries, and electrical equipment that are being manufactured and placed into the stream of commerce with each passing day. I am told that the level of sophistication in counterfeiting has reached the point that you can no longer distinguish between the real and the counterfeit good or label with the naked eye. However, just because these products look the same does not mean that they have the same quality characteristics. The counterfeit products are not subject to the same quality controls of legitimate products, resulting in items that are lower in quality and likely to fall apart. In fact, counterfeit products could potentially kill unsuspecting American consumers.

In addition to closing the "counterfeit label loophole," the Stop Counterfeiting in Manufactured Goods Act strengthens the criminal code and provides heightened penalties for those trafficking in counterfeit marks. Current law does not provide for the seizure and forfeiture of counterfeit trademarks, whether they are attached to goods or not. Therefore, many times such counterfeit goods are seized one day, only to be returned and sold to an unsuspecting public. To ensure that individuals engaging in the practice of trafficking in counterfeit marks cannot reopen their doors, H.R. 32 establishes procedures for the mandatory seizure, forfeiture, and destruction of counterfeit marks prior to a conviction. Further, it provides for procedures for the mandatory forfeiture and destruction of property derived from or

used to engage in the trafficking of counterfeit marks.

When this legislation was sent over to the Senate from the House, concerns were raised to Senator LEAHY and myself about the language in Section 2(bbb)(1)(B) of this bill pertaining to the forfeiture authority of the U.S. Department of Justice. In focusing our attention to this section, we discussed the scope of the facilitation language, which parallels the drug and money laundering forfeiture language in 21 U.S.C. 853 and 18 U.S.C. 982, respectively, and how it might relate to Internet marketplace companies, search engines, and ISPs. Specifically, we were aware of concerns regarding the potential misapplication of the facilitation language in Section 2(b)(1)(B) to pursue forfeiture and seizure proceedings against responsible Internet marketplace companies that serve as third-party intermediaries to online transactions.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, Section 2(b)(1)(B) authorizes U.S. Attorneys to pursue civil in rem forfeiture proceedings against “any property used, in any manner or part, to commit or to facilitate the commission of a violation of subsection (a).” The intent of this language is to provide attorneys and prosecutors with the authority to bring a civil forfeiture action against the property of bad actors who are facilitating trafficking or attempts to traffic in counterfeit marks. The forfeiture authority in Section 2(b)(1)(B) cannot be used to pursue forfeiture and seizure proceedings against the computer equipment, website or network of responsible Internet marketplace companies, who serve solely as a third party to transactions and do not tailor their services or their facilities to the furtherance of trafficking or attempts to traffic in counterfeit marks. However, these Internet marketplace companies must make demonstrable good-faith efforts to combat the use of their systems and services to traffic in counterfeit marks. Companies must establish and implement procedures to take down postings that contain or offer to sell goods, services, labels, and the like in violation of this act upon being made aware of the illegal nature of these items or services.

It is the irresponsible culprits that must be held accountable. Those who profit from another’s innovation have proved their creativity only at escaping responsibility for their actions. As legislators it is important that we provide law enforcement with the tools needed to capture these thieves.

I say to Senator SPECTER, it is also my understanding that the U.S. Sentencing Commission recently promulgated new Federal sentencing guidelines to account for the changes in how intellectual property crimes are committed. Could the Senator clarify for the record why we have authorized the

U.S. Sentencing Commission to further amend the Federal sentencing guidelines and policy statements for crimes committed in violation of title 18, section 2318 or 2320, of the United States Code?

Mr. SPECTER. I say to Senator LEAHY, as the Senator is aware, periodically Congress directs the Sentencing Commission to update the Federal sentencing guidelines upon the periodic directive of Congress to reflect and account for changes in the manner in which intellectual property offenses are committed. The recent amendments to which you refer were promulgated by the Sentencing Commission pursuant to the authorization in the Family Entertainment and Copyright Act of 2005, also known as FECA. These amendments to the Federal sentencing guidelines, which took effect on October 24, 2005, address changes in penalties and definitions for intellectual property rights crimes, particularly those involving copyrighted pre-release works and issues surrounding “uploading.” For example, these guidelines provide for a 25 percent increase in sentences for offenses involving pre-release works. In addition, the Commission revised its definition of “uploading” to ensure that the guidelines are keeping up with technological advances in this area.

I would like to make it clear for the record that the directive to the Sentencing Commission in section 3 of H.R. 32 is not meant as disapproval of the Commission’s recent actions in response to FECA. Rather, section 3 covers other intellectual property rights crimes that Congress believes it is time for the Commission to revisit. Specifically, section 3 directs the Commission to review the guidelines, and particularly the definition of “infringement amount,” to ensure that offenses involving low-cost items like labels, patches, medallions, or packaging that are used to make counterfeit goods that are much more expensive, are properly punished. It also directs the Commission to ensure that the penalty provisions for offenses involving all counterfeit goods or services, or devices used to facilitate counterfeiting, are properly addressed by the guidelines. As it did in response to the No Electronic Theft Act of 1997 and FECA, I am confident that the Commission will ensure that the Federal sentencing guidelines provide adequate punishment and deterrence for these very serious offenses and I look forward to the Commission’s response to this directive.

Mr. LEAHY. I say to Senator SPECTER, thank you for that clarification. As you are aware, there has been overwhelming support for this legislation. It has been very heartening to see such overwhelming support for this important bill. Counterfeiting is a threat to America. It wreaks real harm on our

economy, our workers, and our consumers. This bill is a tough bill that will give law enforcement improved tools to fight this form of theft. The bill is short and straightforward, but its impact should be profound and far reaching.

Mr. SPECTER. At this point, I would like to take this opportunity to thank Representative JIM SENSENBRENNER, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, and Representative JOE KNOLLENBERG for their leadership in the House with regard to H.R. 32. In January of 2005, Representative KNOLLENBERG introduced H.R. 32 in the House. When the bill was in committee, he fostered negotiations between the Department of Justice, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and the International Trademark Association to ensure that it passed the House. I would also like to thank my colleague Senator LEAHY, ranking member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, and Senators ALEXANDER, BAYH, BROWNBACK, COBURN, CORNYN, DEWINE, DURBIN, FEINGOLD, FEINSTEIN, HATCH, KYL, LEVIN, REED, STABENOW, and VOINOVICH for their cosponsorship of S. 1699, the companion legislation to H.R. 32. It is through the hard work of all of these Members that we were able to achieve truly bipartisan support for language that will ensure the protection of American-held trademarks.

Mr. LEAHY. Some of our most important legislation is produced not only when we reach across the aisle in the name of bipartisanship, but when we work across Chambers and reach true consensus. I would also like to thank Senators ALEXANDER, BAYH, BROWNBACK, COBURN, CORNYN, DEWINE, DURBIN, FEINGOLD, FEINSTEIN, HATCH, KYL, LEVIN, REED, STABENOW, and VOINOVICH for their cosponsorship of the Senate companion legislation. Counterfeiting is a serious problem that does not lend itself to a quick and easy solution. This legislation is an important step towards fighting counterfeiting. I hope we can build on the success of this law.

Mr. President, I am pleased to join with Senator CORNYN in another of our bipartisan efforts to improve the lives of Americans through effective and efficient Government. The Protecting American Goods and Services Act of 2005, which was passed unanimously out of the Senate last November as S. 1095, is now part of a package that includes the Stop Counterfeiting in Manufactured Goods Act, which I co-sponsored with Senator SPECTER as S. 1699. The Protecting American Goods and Services Act strengthens our ability to combat the escalating problem of counterfeiting worldwide. In order to effectively fight intellectual property theft, we need stiff penalties for counterfeiters and those who are caught with counterfeit goods with the intent to traffic their false wares. Ours is a short

bill—indeed, it is only two pages long—but it will have global implications in the fight against piracy.

Counterfeiting is a growing problem that costs our economy hundreds of billions of dollars every year and has been linked to organized crime, including terrorist organizations. According to the International Anti-Counterfeiting Coalition, counterfeit parts have been discovered in helicopters sold to NATO, in jet engines, bridge joints, brake pads, and fasteners in equipment designed to prevent nuclear reactor meltdowns. The World Health Organization estimates that the market for counterfeit drugs is about \$32 billion each year.

Several years ago, Senator HATCH joined me in sponsoring the Anti-Counterfeiting Consumer Protection Act of 1996, which addressed counterfeiting by amending several sections of our criminal and tariff codes. That law made important changes, particularly by expanding RICO, the Federal antiracketeering law, to cover crimes involving counterfeiting and copyright and trademark infringement. Then, as now, trafficking in counterfeit goods hurts purchasers, State and Federal Governments, and economies at every level.

Perhaps most disturbingly, the U.S. Customs Service reports that terrorists have used transnational counterfeiting operations to fund their activities: The sale of counterfeit and pirated music, movies, software, T-shirts, clothing, and fake drugs “accounts for much of the money the international terrorist network depends on to feed its operations.”

Last year, as in years past, I worked with Senator ALLEN on an amendment to the Foreign Operations bill that provides the State Department with vital resources to combat piracy of U.S. goods abroad. The bill we ultimately passed included \$3 million for this important purpose. Yet more work both at home and abroad remains. When you consider that the economic impact of tangible piracy in counterfeit goods is estimated to be roughly \$350 billion a year and to constitute between 5 percent and 7 percent of worldwide trade, a few million dollars is a worthwhile investment.

We have certainly seen how this form of theft touches the lives of hard-working Vermonters. Burton Snowboards is a small company, whose innovation has made it an industry leader in snowboarding equipment and apparel. Unfortunately, knock-off products carrying Burton's name have been found across the globe. Vanessa Price, a representative of Burton, testified about counterfeiting at the Judiciary Committee's March 23, 2004, hearing on this topic. In addition to learning about the economic costs of counterfeiting, I asked her after the hearing about the risks posed to consumers by these goods. Her answer was chilling:

In the weeks since my Senate testimony, I discovered a shipment of counterfeit Burton boots for sale through a discount sports outfit . . . After examining the poor quality of the counterfeit boots, we determined that anyone using the boots for snowboarding risks injury due to a lack of reinforcement and support in the product's construction.

Customers and businesses lose out to counterfeiters in other ways, too. SB Electronics in Barre, VT, has seen its capacitors reverse engineered and its customers lost to inferior copycat models. Vermont Tubbs, a furniture manufacturer in Rutland, has seen its designs copied, produced offshore with inferior craftsmanship and materials, and then reimported, so that the company is competing against cheaper versions of its own products. And Hubbardton Forge in Castleton, VT, has seen its beautiful and original lamps counterfeited and then sold within the United States at prices—and quality—far below their own. This is wrong. It is unfair to consumers who deserve the high quality goods they think they are paying for, and it is unfair to innovators who play by the rules and deserve to profit from their labor.

This bill helps to combat this growing scourge.

S. 1095 criminalizes the possession of counterfeit goods with the intent to sell or traffic in those goods, and it expands the definition of “traffic” to include any distribution of counterfeits with the expectation of gaining something of value—criminals should not be able to skirt the law simply because they barter illegal goods and services in exchange for their illicit wares. Finally, the bill will criminalize the importation and exportation of counterfeit goods, as well as of bootleg copies of copyrighted works into and out of the United States.

By tying off these loopholes and improving U.S. laws on counterfeiting, we are sending a powerful message to the criminals who belong in jail, and to our innovators.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Specter substitute at the desk be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read the third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid on the table, and that any statements thereon be printed in the RECORD.

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

The amendment (No. 2889) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To amend title 18, United States Code, to provide criminal penalties for trafficking in counterfeit marks, clarify the prohibition on the trafficking in goods or services, and for other purposes)

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. TRAFFICKING IN COUNTERFEIT MARKS.

(a) SHORT TITLE; FINDINGS.—

(1) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “Stop Counterfeiting in Manufactured Goods Act”.

(2) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(A) the United States economy is losing millions of dollars in tax revenue and tens of thousands of jobs because of the manufacture, distribution, and sale of counterfeit goods;

(B) the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection estimates that counterfeiting costs the United States \$200 billion annually;

(C) counterfeit automobile parts, including brake pads, cost the auto industry alone billions of dollars in lost sales each year;

(D) counterfeit products have invaded numerous industries, including those producing auto parts, electrical appliances, medicines, tools, toys, office equipment, clothing, and many other products;

(E) ties have been established between counterfeiting and terrorist organizations that use the sale of counterfeit goods to raise and launder money;

(F) ongoing counterfeiting of manufactured goods poses a widespread threat to public health and safety; and

(G) strong domestic criminal remedies against counterfeiting will permit the United States to seek stronger anticounterfeiting provisions in bilateral and international agreements with trading partners.

(b) TRAFFICKING IN COUNTERFEIT MARKS.—Section 2320 of title 18, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) is amended by inserting after “such goods or services” the following:

“, or intentionally traffics or attempts to traffic in labels, patches, stickers, wrappers, badges, emblems, medallions, charms, boxes, containers, cans, cases, hangtags, documentation, or packaging of any type or nature, knowing that a counterfeit mark has been applied thereto, the use of which is likely to cause confusion, to cause mistake, or to deceive.”

(2) Subsection (b) is amended to read as follows:

“(b)(1) The following property shall be subject to forfeiture to the United States and no property right shall exist in such property:

“(A) Any article bearing or consisting of a counterfeit mark used in committing a violation of subsection (a).

“(B) Any property used, in any manner or part, to commit or to facilitate the commission of a violation of subsection (a).

“(2) The provisions of chapter 46 of this title relating to civil forfeitures, including section 983 of this title, shall extend to any seizure or civil forfeiture under this section. At the conclusion of the forfeiture proceedings, the court, unless otherwise requested by an agency of the United States, shall order that any forfeited article bearing or consisting of a counterfeit mark be destroyed or otherwise disposed of according to law.

“(3)(A) The court, in imposing sentence on a person convicted of an offense under this section, shall order, in addition to any other sentence imposed, that the person forfeit to the United States—

“(i) any property constituting or derived from any proceeds the person obtained, directly or indirectly, as the result of the offense;

“(ii) any of the person's property used, or intended to be used, in any manner or part, to commit, facilitate, aid, or abet the commission of the offense; and

“(iii) any article that bears or consists of a counterfeit mark used in committing the offense.

“(B) The forfeiture of property under subparagraph (A), including any seizure and disposition of the property and any related judicial or administrative proceeding, shall be

governed by the procedures set forth in section 413 of the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 (21 U.S.C. 853), other than subsection (d) of that section. Notwithstanding section 413(h) of that Act, at the conclusion of the forfeiture proceedings, the court shall order that any forfeited article or component of an article bearing or consisting of a counterfeit mark be destroyed.

“(4) When a person is convicted of an offense under this section, the court, pursuant to sections 3556, 3663A, and 3664, shall order the person to pay restitution to the owner of the mark and any other victim of the offense as an offense against property referred to in section 3663A(c)(1)(A)(ii).

“(5) The term ‘victim’, as used in paragraph (4), has the meaning given that term in section 3663A(a)(2).”

(3) Subsection (e)(1) is amended—

(A) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(A) a spurious mark—

“(i) that is used in connection with trafficking in any goods, services, labels, patches, stickers, wrappers, badges, emblems, medallions, charms, boxes, containers, cans, cases, hangtags, documentation, or packaging of any type or nature;

“(ii) that is identical with, or substantially indistinguishable from, a mark registered on the principal register in the United States Patent and Trademark Office and in use, whether or not the defendant knew such mark was so registered;

“(iii) that is applied to or used in connection with the goods or services for which the mark is registered with the United States Patent and Trademark Office, or is applied to or consists of a label, patch, sticker, wrapper, badge, emblem, medallion, charm, box, container, can, case, hangtag, documentation, or packaging of any type or nature that is designed, marketed, or otherwise intended to be used on or in connection with the goods or services for which the mark is registered in the United States Patent and Trademark Office; and

“(iv) the use of which is likely to cause confusion, to cause mistake, or to deceive; or”;

(B) by amending the matter following subparagraph (B) to read as follows:

“but such term does not include any mark or designation used in connection with goods or services, or a mark or designation applied to labels, patches, stickers, wrappers, badges, emblems, medallions, charms, boxes, containers, cans, cases, hangtags, documentation, or packaging of any type or nature used in connection with such goods or services, of which the manufacturer or producer was, at the time of the manufacture or production in question, authorized to use the mark or designation for the type of goods or services so manufactured or produced, by the holder of the right to use such mark or designation.”

(4) Section 2320 is further amended—

(A) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (g); and

(B) by inserting after subsection (e) the following:

“(f) Nothing in this section shall entitle the United States to bring a criminal cause of action under this section for the repackaging of genuine goods or services not intended to deceive or confuse.”

(C) SENTENCING GUIDELINES.—

(1) REVIEW AND AMENDMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the United States Sentencing Commission, pursuant to its authority under section 994 of title 28, United States Code, and

in accordance with this subsection, shall review and, if appropriate, amend the Federal sentencing guidelines and policy statements applicable to persons convicted of any offense under section 2318 or 2320 of title 18, United States Code.

(2) AUTHORIZATION.—The United States Sentencing Commission may amend the Federal sentencing guidelines in accordance with the procedures set forth in section 21(a) of the Sentencing Act of 1987 (28 U.S.C. 994 note) as though the authority under that section had not expired.

(3) RESPONSIBILITIES OF UNITED STATES SENTENCING COMMISSION.—In carrying out this subsection, the United States Sentencing Commission shall determine whether the definition of ‘infringement amount’ set forth in application note 2 of section 2B5.3 of the Federal sentencing guidelines is adequate to address situations in which the defendant has been convicted of one of the offenses listed in paragraph (1) and the item in which the defendant trafficked was not an infringing item but rather was intended to facilitate infringement, such as an anti-circumvention device, or the item in which the defendant trafficked was infringing and also was intended to facilitate infringement in another good or service, such as a counterfeit label, documentation, or packaging, taking into account cases such as *U.S. v. Sung*, 87 F.3d 194 (7th Cir. 1996).

SEC. 2. TRAFFICKING DEFINED.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ‘‘Protecting American Goods and Services Act of 2005’’.

(b) COUNTERFEIT GOODS OR SERVICES.—Section 2320(e) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

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

“(2) the term ‘traffic’ means to transport, transfer, or otherwise dispose of, to another, for purposes of commercial advantage or private financial gain, or to make, import, export, obtain control of, or possess, with intent to so transport, transfer, or otherwise dispose of;”;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) the term ‘financial gain’ includes the receipt, or expected receipt, of anything of value; and”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) SOUND RECORDINGS AND MUSIC VIDEOS OF LIVE MUSICAL PERFORMANCES.—Section 2319A(e) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) the term ‘traffic’ has the same meaning as in section 2320(e) of this title.”.

(2) COUNTERFEIT LABELS FOR PHONORECORDS, COMPUTER PROGRAMS, ETC.—Section 2318(b) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) the term ‘traffic’ has the same meaning as in section 2320(e) of this title;”.

(3) ANTI-BOOTLEGGING.—Section 1101 of title 17, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ‘traffic’ has the same meaning as in section 2320(e) of title 18.”.

The bill (H.R. 32), as amended, was read the third time and passed.

KATRINA EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE ACT OF 2005

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of calendar No. 229, S. 1777.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

A bill (S. 1777) to provide relief for the victims of Hurricane Katrina.

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

Mr. LEIBERMAN. Mr. President, I have been pleased to work with Senator COLLINS to draft and reach agreement on this legislation to provide relief for the victims of Hurricane Katrina.

The package that the Senate is passing today does not contain everything that I would like, but I think the provisions of this bill will make a real difference for the families and their communities.

The challenges facing our country in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina are like nothing we have faced in modern times—if ever.

This legislation has four parts.

First, this measure will provide an additional 13 weeks of Federal Disaster Unemployment Assistance for those who lost their jobs because of Hurricane Katrina, thereby extending the duration of benefits from the current 26 weeks to 39 weeks. More than 46,000 gulf coast workers were left jobless as a result of Hurricane Katrina, and this legislation is urgently needed, as these workers will run out of their 26 weeks of Federal assistance starting March 4.

Those who qualify for Disaster Unemployment Assistance, or DUA, generally do not qualify for regular unemployment benefits. They mostly include the self-employed, like fisherman and small business owners, who make up a vital sector of the economy in the gulf coast. Their weekly DUA assistance, which corresponds to the amounts provided in regular unemployment benefits in the States, is modest, at best. In Louisiana, for example, the weekly DUA benefit averages just \$100 a week.

The version of this legislation that I proposed on the Senate floor on September 15, 2005, would have also increased the minimum DUA benefit to \$135 a week, or half the national average unemployment benefit, and that was retained in our bill reported out of the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs committee; the compromise amendment now before the Senate leaves the benefit levels under current statute unchanged.

The fact that so many families remain unemployed almost 6 months after the storm is a grave reminder that we as a Nation still have far to go to realize our promise of hope to the proud people of New Orleans and rest of the gulf coast who suffered the worst natural disaster this Nation has ever