HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

House Bill 2295

* * * * * * * * * *

Judiciary Committee

--000---

Main Capitol Building Room 140, Majority Caucus Room Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

Wednesday, February 14, 1996 - 10:00 a.m.

--000--

BEFORE:

Honorable Thomas Gannon, Majority Chairman

Honorable Jerry Birmelin

Honorable Scot J. Chadwick

Honorable Stephen Maitland

Honorable Al Masland

Honorable Robert Reber

Honorable Chris Wogan

Honorable Peter Daley

Honorable Frank Dermody

Honorable Harold James

Honorable Kathy Manderino

Honorable David Mayernik

ORIGINAL

KEY REPORTERS 1300 Garrison Drive, York, PA 17404 (717) 764-7801 Fax (717) 764-6373

X

ALSO PRESENT:

Karen Dalton, Esquire Counsel for Judiciary Committee

Dan Fellin, Esquire Counsel for Judiciary Committee

Judy Sedesse, Committee Administrative Assistant

CONTENTS

WITNESSES	PAGE
Opening remarks by Chairman Gannon	4
Vans Stevenson Vice President of State Legislation Motion Picture Association of America	4
Karin Krueger Counsel for State Legislation Motion Picture Association of America	9
Phillip Parker Field Investigator Motion Picture Association of America	14

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

CHAIRMAN GANNON: We are ready to go. There are some other members that will be coming in, but I don't want to hold everybody up. There are several other meetings going on. would like to call our first witness, Mr. Vans Stevenson, and then why don't we have all three witnesses at the table at the same time. Karin Krueger, Counsel for the State Legislation Motion Picture Association of America: Phillip Parker, Field Investigator, the Motion Picture Association of America; and Vans Stevenson, the Vice President of State Legislation, Motion Picture Association of America.

Good morning and thank you for coming here today to give us some insight into this issue of the pirating of motion pictures and videos.

Mr. Stevenson.

MR. STEVENSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee. It is a real pleasure to be here and we appreciate the opportunity to be able to testify in support of this bill. On behalf of Jack Valenti and the Motion Picture Association and our member companies: Disney, MGM, Paramount Pictures, Sony Pictures, Twentieth Century Fox, Turner

Pictures, Universal and Warner Brothers. We
appreciate the support that the Commonwealth of

Pennsylvania has given the motion picture
industry over the past years by putting a strong

piracy bill in place which we have right now,
and we appreciate this opportunity to come here
again because we need new weapons in our arsenal
in an attempt to fight anti-piracy.

I think, as all of you are aware, this legislation will strengthen existing law which is combined to combat illegal counterfeiting of motion pictures on videocassette. It also provides protection for motion picture theatres to detain individuals who attempt to record motion pictures on camcorders off of movie screens.

We would like to cover why this legislation is necessary in three parts, if it is okay?

I am going to handle the economic issues, Karin Krueger will handle the legal, and Phil Parker will talk about the law enforcement aspects.

First, economic. Video piracy is the

deliberate duplication for sale and rental of motion pictures on videocassettes for sale and rental in stores, on street corners and in flea markets is a billion dollar a year business in the United States and a \$4 billion a year business worldwide.

That is how much money our member companies in the motion picture industry lose each year, we estimate.

Those kinds of dollars translate into millions in losses to everyone from legitimate video stores in the Commonwealth and our member companies and the rest of the motion picture industry.

Most motion pictures today are financed because of the guaranteed revenue home video sales to retailers and the public usually generate on a title by title basis. And with the average cost to produce, distribute and market a motion picture is about \$50 million. Home video revenues are significant and vital to be able to produce those kinds of movies.

Since the motion picture business is speculative from the standpoint that no one really knows if anyone is going to come once you

make it, it's imperative that we do everything possible to protect our only asset from being stolen. If piracy continues to accelerate, it will affect the dollars available to reinvest in new productions and produce those kinds of movies that the public has grown to anticipate and demand both here in the Commonwealth and around the country.

In addition, rampant and uncontrolled piracy could affect the price of videocassettes for sale and rental. Less legitimate demand means prices could rise. That also means an erosion of sales tax receipts from the millions of retail transactions in the Commonwealth on an annual basis.

This relatively new development of street sales of camcorder copies of recently released movies in urban areas and at flea markets, strikes at movie theatres directly because people are buying a movie that is still in the theatre long before it gets to home video. We are usually talking a three to six month window between the time the movie is in your movie theatre and the time that you see it on the shelf of a BlockBuster or and independent

retailer.

Most of the tapes that we are talking about that have been camcordered off of movie screens are inferior in, of course, quality.

And you will see some examples of that in a few minutes. But the technology is improving and that means the movie patrons that may buy these tapes may be discouraged from going to the theatre and/or buying and renting the cassette when it comes out legitimately in the store three to six months later.

extend also in the foreign markets. Piracy, I think all of you may have read, is pretty rampant overseas. We are trying to bring it under control, but it is a very, very difficult prospect. Illegal street corner sales of camcorder copies in major cities like Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, New York, Chicago, have been used as an example in sensitive negotiations along the Pacific rim.

A number of foreign governments have inquired about the urgency of promoting new copy right laws in their own countries to protect

American product when we cannot control the

problem here.

In the District of Columbia last year, they recently enacted identical provisions to those proposed in House Bill 2295, and that has helped to clean up the illegal street sales in our nation's capitol. Enacting similar provisions in Pennsylvania, which has been identified as a major production and distribution center for counterfeit videos, will further enhance our chances to ensure further copy right protection in foreign markets. In other words, we can point to this as another example that we are not going to stand by and let this happen here or any place else.

At this point, I would like to turn the part our presentation over to Karin Kruegler, MPA State Legal Counsel, to explain why we need harsher penalties and protection for theatre employees to detain movie thieves.

Karin.

MS. KRUEGER: Thank you. Can you hear me?

Well, the first thing I would like to emphasize is this is really a consumer protection bill. It is a consumer protection

measure that works well to protect consumers as well as allowing law enforcement to participate in a socially as well as economically beneficial endeavor.

that the Commonwealth already has requires that any video product that is sold must have the true name and address of the distributor on the box of the jacket of the video. This is so that consumers know who they can turn to, if they pop in the movie and there is something wrong with the quality, there is something harmful that was not supposed to be in there and they have somewhere to go to. The failure to label the jacket of the video to put the true name and address is a violation of the law that is already in existense.

Now, quite obviously, counterfeits, pirates, counterfeiters, are not going to put their true name and address on the jackets of these products. They are not quite that bold. But they are bold enough to start counterfeiting and pirating just thousands and thousands of videos at a time now. Hundreds of VCRs going, and the number of product that is being

counterfeited, is increasing rapidly.

Additionally, since the quality is getting much better, the value of their product is increasing and they are pumping up their prices because it looks like it is the real thing. And when these pirates defraud consumers, people, you know, that buy these videos, they have no redress, there is no one they can turn to.

Now, I don't know what your experience, if any, has been, but we have gotten calls from state legislators in other states. They have been getting calls from people saying we bought these videos and we cannot get our money back and we want to know why. We want to get our money back. And, unfortunately, we are at a loss, we can't really help them in getting their money back. We do have a counterfeit line that we turn to for complaints to help catch the people doing it, but there is just no redress.

So why do we need the enhanced legislation in this bill?

Well, first of all, this bill provides higher penalties for the baseline number of counterfeit products. And we really believe

that this increase in penalty is going to help.

Because, unfortunately, right now, people think

of counterfeiting as more of a quasi-criminal

activity. You know, it is not that bad. And

this is only re-enforced by the lower penalties

and minor fines. It has become almost a cost of

doing business. You know, pay the fine, do the

minimal jail time, if any, in a county jail.

When the penalty becomes a felony, as this bill makes it, the ramifications become, rachet it up greatly and people begin to think twice about doing the cost of business. And, additionally, it gives judges the power to sentence harsher and look at the aggravating circumstances when there are thousands of tapes and hundreds of VCRs going. And they can also maybe use the state prison system instead of the county jail system which also makes people again think twice. So that is one thing about this bill.

Another provision of this legislation, which we believe will add meaningful reform in this new era of high technology is, as Vans mentioned, people have been camcordering movies right off the screens and, unfortunately,

theatre owners are stymied by the law or the lack of the law in the Commonwealth to be able to stop these people from actually filming the movie off the screen.

Right now, someone goes to opening day at a theatre and that film is out on the street within hours. I mean, literally. That premier is the night before and you see that film on the street the next day, that is how good they are getting. A theatre owner, for fear of liability, civil or criminal, false imprisonment, all sorts of liabilities that we now have, will not or cannot take the person and say stop that and let me call the police and deal with this.

So this legislation prohibits the actual act of camcordering off the screen.

Something that I think we probably all think is, if not illegal, immoral. You know, it is stealing. It is like if I walk into a department store and just took a product and left with it. It is theft.

Which brings up a final provision of this legislation, which is, it allows the theatre owner to actually detain the person in a

reasonable manner if caught camcordering. Just like if the person were to reach over and grab a box of raisonettes from the candy counter, that person would be able to stop that person, take them and call the police. Well, if they catch them camcordering, they cannot do that. So this provision will bring the camcordering into the realm of theft, and allow them, without fear of criminal or civil liability, to any reasonable manner. And it spells out all of the, you know, you have to be reasonable and you have to have probable cause and it has to be for a reasonable time, can detain the person.

And we believe this is good common sense and it's good for the Commonwealth.

Because we believe, as Vans mentioned,

counterfeiters are not only stealing from us,

they are stealing from consumers and they are

stealing from the Commonwealth in tax dollars.

And we think this will really help clean up the

streets. And now I would like to turn it over

to Phil who will actually tell you how they

clean up the streets.

MR. PARKER: Thanks, Karin. My name is Phil Parker and I have been with the Motion

Picture Association since 1988 and, since 1991,

I have been the regional field rep. which covers
the area from Pennsylvania to Virginia and out
to Tennessee.

The video pirates have been active for many years. Most of the time they have, the major part of the time, they have been copying videos that come out in a video rental store.

If a store such as BlockBusters gets a video on a Thursday, they would rent that video and begin copying it and by Friday the pirated copies would be out on the street.

During the past two years, we have noticed an interesting phenomenon and that is people are going into movie theatres holding a camcorder or putting it on a tripod and actually recording from the screen. As you can imagine, the quality is atrocious, both the visual and audio. However, there have been very many improvements in home recorders, home camera recorders and they are getting better. That is, in effect, what has been happening over the past two years.

Prior to this time, these people were renting or selling these videos. Ones that are

copied from rental stores, they would go out and sell these to the small video stores throughout the United States.

A normal videocassette would cost 60 to 80 dollars and they would be able to sell these things to a small video rental establishment for 30 dollars. So the person could see a savings, even though they, for the most part, knew that they were illegal.

The newest generation, those that are being copied from the movie screen, are not being sold to rental stores, they are being sold to vendors who are going to take them out on the street and sell them on the street corner or taken to flea markets and swop meets where they'll be sold from various stands there.

Philadelphia is a major production center of pirated videos. Over the past two years, we have probably, With the Pennsylvania State Police and the Philadelphia District Attorney's Office, raided probably 12, what we call, laboratories that actually produced the video themselves. And from them, we have probably taken 1500 videocassette recorders, which were being used to record these illegal

videos.

In the course of these investigations, we found that this, that there are several groups, organizations, that are in fact doing the pirating. There is a competition among the groups. They are continuing criminal enterprises. They are organized crime. They are making money like you would not believe.

In one place, we found a hundred and five video recorders and the State Police found records indicating that the individual was making over \$30,000 a month, clear profit. They also confiscated over \$130,000 in cash and money orders. This is a significant criminal organization.

We have had people tell us that video piracy is the new drug, but it is a lot better because the money is almost as good as dealing drugs but the penalties are very light. They don't worry about going to jail for the first four or five times they are arrested for video piracy.

The people who are putting out these pirated videos, both the ones that have already been released in VHS format as well as those

which are just opening in the theatre, have an organization that rivals almost any drug organization. One location will have the videocassette recorders, another location will have the printing, the printing of the labels, the printing of the sleeves. These then will come together in a third location for assembly and then possibly a fourth location for storage and distribution. You have runners who are picking up hundreds of videocassettes, taking them as far south as Atlanta, Georgia, certainly out to Pittsburgh where we have had significant success with the Pennsylvania State Police and the Pittsburgh Police in seizing thousands of pirated videos in Pittsburgh.

1.3

Just before Christmas, in Philadelphia, with the State Police and the District Attorney's Office, we seized over 20,000 videocassettes from vendors on the street. Half of these were theatrical releases. The other half were those videos which had already been releaseed in VHS format. Two weeks ago, in Philadelphia, we seized another 8,000. So the law enforcement organizations are working very closely with us, they are doing an outstanding

job and we certainly see the problem but it is getting tougher all the time.

As Karin mentioned, as soon as a theatrical, a new movie is released in the theatre, the day after that, you can buy it on the street, in Germantown, in Pittsburgh, in North Versailles. They had the means and the distribution to get these things out on the street.

There is no quality control. We have had complaints from parents who have called in who had looked at a children's video. At the end of it or at some point in the middle of it, it dissolves into a — something that they would not want their children to see, be it pornographic or an adult video. So these are the things that, you know, we have to put up with complaints from the public also.

I do have some examples of what a camcordered video looks like and I will be happy to show those to you, if you would like, as well as some examples of the labels and packaging that they have provided.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Sure. Could you identify these for our stenographer?

1	MR. PARKER: Oh, yes. The first one is
2	007. Was it Golden Eye?
3	MS. KRUEGER: Golden Eye.
4	MR. PARKER: If you will notice, you
5	will see the camera is looking at the theatre,
6	and he just arranged the telephoto aspect of the
7	film so it covers the whole screen.
8	MR. STEVENSON: But keep in mind, also,
9	this is three to six months away from home video
10	release.
11	CHAIRMAN GANNON: This hasn't been
12	released yet?
13	MR. STEVENSON: No, it is still in
14	theatrical distribution at this point.
15	MR. PARKER: Could you turn that up
16	just a little bit?
17	You will also be able to This should
18	be in stereo sound with good clarity. Instead,
19	it sounds like you are in a 50-gallon steel
20	drum.
21	Okay. Would you put in Die Hard?
22	REP. MAYERNIK: Do they sit in the
23	front row to do this or do they set the tripod
24	up in the middle of the?

MR. PARKER: Well, they sit in

1	different locations and you can tell where they
2	are. This one was probably sitting well back.
3	But some of them, if they are sitting in the
4	front row, you have elongation of the picture
5	itself because the person is looking up and it
6	gives a skewed aspect.
7	MS. KRUEGER: Sometimes you get heads
8	in the picture if they are further back.
9	MR. PARKER: You can see people
10	sometimes walk.
11	This is Die Hard With A Vengeance.
12	Could you rewind that all the way back?
13	REP. DERMODY: What are they copying
14	for the labels on this jacket?
15	MR. PARKER: If you will look at one of
16	these, in one case, they just went to the
17	theatre and copied the poster from the theatre.
18	You can actually see the reflection of the
19	person taking the picture.
20	REP. MANDERINO: There is your
21	evidence.
22	MR. PARKER: But it is not illegal.
23	REP. MAYERNIK: Have you had occasions
24	where they have actually spotted people with the

video equipment and attempted to take it away

1	from them?
2	MR. PARKER: Yes, we have.
3	REP. MAYERNIK: And they have been
4	unable to prosecute in Pennsylvania?
5	MR. PARKER: That's correct.
6	CHAIRMAN GANNON: Why don't we hold up
7	on the questions until after this? Because I
8	think everybody will have a couple of questions
9	after we get this done.
ιo	MR. STEVENSON: The quality on this one
۱1	is a little bit better.
12	MR. PARKER: But if you look at the
13	writing, as it will come up, you won't be able
14	to read it. It will be very blurred.
15	MS. KRUEGER: It is supposed to say Die
16	Hard.
17	MR. PARKER: They even read that
18	because the letters are larger. You can also
19	see at the top and the bottom of the screen how
20	it is, in fact, showing the top of the screen
21	and the theater itself.
22	Okay. I think that's fine. Thank you.
23	MR. STEVENSON: Mr. Chairman, we would
24	be happy to answer any questions anybody might

have.

1

2

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Representative Reber.

REP. REBER: Just one quick question.

Counselwoman, on page seven of the bill, Section 418, Section (4), relative to someone being admitted to the theatre in which a motion picture is to be or is being exhibited and refuses to surrender, and what have you, the device. As I was looking at your testimony and also looking at that section, I visualized Philadelphia, of course, being a place where a lot of tourists seem to be going and they have obviously these for, they go down to Independence Hall and they tape the Liberty Bell and you know the scene of Benjamin Franklin and the Rising Sun and all of that kind of stuff and then they decide to come up Chestnut Street and go into a theatre and they have their camcorders.

My question is this: do you have any objection, after including that section, it would be something to the effect that at the point of ticket sales and/or ticket pick-up, if you will, or checking in, that there would be some form of posting or are you worried about the posting disappearing?

I guess what I am getting at is: I just can see a lot of innocent people taking these things in and sitting it down and all of a sudden one of their eight year olds gets the bright idea he wants to pick this thing up and see if it works and you have some employee come charging down the aisle and say, whoa, wait a minute, that type of thing. How are we going to handle those innocent situations?

MR. STEVENSON: I think from the theatre's perspective where we develop this particular language, they are really looking to be able to protect themselves as would somebody in a department store. They are really going to be focusing on somebody who is an adult that sits down and starts camcordering. I don't think at the point of sale that you are going to have the problem of a theatre saying, no, you can't bring that in here. There is going to be discretion.

This same legislation is now working and has been for about a year in New York,
California and the District of Columbia where camcordering, you know, has been going on and those kinds of problems have not developed so

far that we have seen.

REP. REBER: Maybe I should pose the question a different way. Do you have any objection to exhibiting language that expressly notes the particular statute, the penalties and the crimes for, in fact, using a camcorder to pirate or to otherwise record, however you might want to phrase it? Do you have any objection to that?

MR. STEVENSON: I don't think so.

MS. KRUEGER: Are you saying you are going to require it?

REP. REBER: I don't know what I am going to do. I don't know if I am going to do anything. I am just curious about developing --

MS. KRUEGER: We certainly have no problem with theatres, with people putting up language which says that.

MR. STEVENSON: I think theatres might object to a posting just because they don't want to look like they are being Draconian when most of their patrons are not going to be bringing camcorders into theatres. And I think, at least at this point, it is a point of discretion more than anything else.

1

2

4

5

6

8

7

9

11

10

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I think, in most cases, it is going to be a theatre manager coming in to take somebody out or calling the police if they identify somebody in the theatre actually camcordering off the screen.

REP. REBER: I understand your intent. You know, that is perfectly logical. But having done criminal defense work in the real world, the perfectly illogical happens all so very often and it is to that extent that this committee sort of has a tradition, a hallmark, if you will, of trying to avoid targets and doing its own work in this particular setting. That was the reason why I asked the question. There was some overburdensome, some economic detriment or something of that nature that would mitigate the particular person who is in charge of the theatre -- owner I should say -- from doing something to at least advise the public at the appropriate spot so they would be on notice and forewarned.

All right. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. STEVENSON: I would be happy to talk to the theatre owners association in Pennsylvania and their national office to see if

1 they have any concerns about that and get back 2 to you. 3 REP. REBER: If per chance something 4 would come out of that where you would even have 5 some suggestive language you would want us to 6 refer it to the Chairman, that would be fine. 7 MR. STEVENSON: I would be happy to do 8 that. 9 REP. REBER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 10 CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you, 11 Representative Reber. 12 Representative Masland. 13 REP. MASLAND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 14 I have a comment and then a question at the end. 15 I don't think obviously any of us here are 16 opposed to this legislation. I do note that no 17 one on the agenda is going to present the 18 opposing view. It would have been interesting. 19 Staff might have been able to work a little 20 harder to find somebody to come in with that 21 perspective. It would have made the 22 investigation a little bit easier. 23 I do have to come clean on one thing,

though, also. And I guess I take slight

exception with Karin Krueger's statement that

24

people that go in theatres to record things are doing an immoral act. I have to defend my grandparents who, back in the 1930s, went in the theatre and did quite a good job of recording the three little pigs, taking it home, and then splicing it with movies of my mother and her brother and sister as my grandfather read to them on the rocking chair and then he spliced away the scene of the Big Bad Wolf and all of those things.

MS. KRUEGER: We take it all back.

REP. MASLAND: That's okay, that's okay.

One other thing you did not mention and I would like to comment on: the consumer protection aspect where people call up and say, hey, there is nothing we can do, there is no money back. I don't know if you want to say buyer beware. Or whether they were, in effect, guilty of receiving stolen property or should have been on the property that that illegally obtained just on the basis of the cut rate price. So I don't have a whole lot of sympathy for them and I don't think that's the major reason for the bill. And I don't know whether

these people are going to be scared away by the fact that we have a felony rating as opposed to a misdemeanor. I mean, obviously, it is a very lucrative business. And as we have seen with mandatory sentences with drugs, I don't think mandatory sentences here would work either. I don't know if that's going to be proposed.

But I think that's the main thing, is to try to catch them and that is really the difficult aspect of it. To the extent that this legislation helps you do that or spurs on more investigations, I guess, I guess will benefit. But it is a very difficult area.

I had heard on the radio just recently, and I was reminded by Brian Preski that there is a big concern also in the area of software for CDs, Microsoft getting ripped-off to the tune of billions in China and different places like that.

My question is -- and I am not sure from reading this -- whether or not that is covered or could be covered under this type of legislation. The way I read the recorded device, it does say, on page 2: Any phonograph record, disc ... it goes on to talk about ...

sound or images that are recorded. I am not sure. I am no technology on it. I can't say that that is necessarily going to cover the CDs or CD Roms and I was wondering whether you have seen legislation that does do that in other states and if that is something we should try to incorporate?

MR. STEVENSON: I think the word disc is the operative word there, to cover, you know, the multitude of discs that are out there, CD Roms, etc. That's a growing problem, I think that Phil can address. And, as you rightly point out, in China, where there is virtually a hundred percent piracy, there are huge factories manufacturing CD Audios, CD Roms, and all of that kind of thing. A lot of it has not found its way back here yet, but it is only a matter of time.

We would certainly be glad to re-look at this with you all in terms of maybe explaining that language, but I think that was our intent there.

REP. MASLAND: Okay. So you don't intend obviously to exclude them?

MR. STEVENSON: Absolutely not.

_ .

1 REP. MASLAND: I guess the question would be to make sure that is included if we are 2 going to attack this problem. Certainly, it is 3 very much related. 4 5 MR. STEVENSON: Absolutely. MS. KRUEGER: Also, if I may add? 6 7 is also why we added other tangible article now 8 known or later developed just because technology 9 in all of these areas is moving so rapidly that 10 we really did want to catch the whole range. 11 REP. MASLAND: Sure. And again my grandparents did a much better job. 12 If anybody 13 would like to see that sometime? It is going to 14 be a tough one for me and my brother and sister, 15 who ultimately gets that. 16 MS. KRUEGER: Just don't copy it. 17 CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you, 18 Representative Masland. Representative Manderino. 19 20 Thank you, Mr. REP. MANDERINO: 21 I think I more just want to make Chairman. 22 comments, I guess for the edification of the 23 committee.

I understand the problem and am

interested in doing something about it and so

24

don't oppose the idea of the legislation. have a couple of concerns that I would like us as a committee to look at. One deals under Section 4116 and thereon where they talk about theatre owners' rights and the whole notion of a theatre owner's standard of conduct in investigation being probable cause to believe.

I think that we should look at the shoplifting statutes and things like that and That is kind of the other comparable area see. where I could think of somebody who is not a law enforcement person who has a right to detain. don't know. I think counsel and I, at sidebar, he indicated that he thinks it is a reasonable misstandard, not a legal probable cause standard, and I think that is something that we as a committee should look at.

Even in the shoplifting area where people might think of it as being a small in magnitude crime. I don't know how many of you saw the 60 Minutes. I think it was a 60 Minutes expose' in the past month or so about the organized cartels ...

> MS. KRUEGER: Right.

REP. MANDERINO: ... and shoplifting

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

rings and they can net \$500,000 in a week through their organized ring. So we are talking big dollars and big losses in that industry, too. So I think that that is a comparable statute for us to look at when we are talking about whether some of the detention areas in here, some of the grading areas. I don't know off the top of my head how that is graded, but a felony of the third degree and the comparable jail time that that may or may not include, I don't know how that kind of compares but I think that is something that we should be careful about.

And I guess my third area where I had a little bit of problem was on page seven. And, again, I don't know that it is a problem, but I want us as a committee to look at it, the liability section, Subsection (c), beginning on line 15. And, again, I would say it seems to me that the liability or limitation to liability that we give in this area, it also makes sense to parallel what seems to work right now and what has been historically used in the retail theft area. So, those are just some areas that I would point out for us as a committee to look

1 | at.

2		Thank you,
3	Representative Manderino.	

Representative James.

REP. JAMES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I was just reviewing. And I am sorry that I am
late.

My concern is that, I was just looking at the third degree felony for the personal offense of taking a recording in a movie theatre. Is that what they asked in this bill?

REP. JAMES: It just seems that third degree felony, it just seems a little harsh.

Isn't that like, I don't know, 17, and 7 years now?

And if you make it -- See, I don't see how that relates to the retail theft laws. I don't think that's a third degree felony.

MR. STEVENSON: I think the difference here is when you photograph a movie off a screen, that can be duplicated hundreds and hundreds of times over and you are talking hundreds of thousands of dollars potentially in terms of how widely it gets distributed. The

1	movie that is camcordered in a theatre in
2	Philadelphia that winds up on the streets of
3	Pittsburgh, Washington, Norfolk, Atlanta, you
4	know, one picture has created thousands of
5	dollars of revenue and I think that that is our
6	thought behind it. You know, this is just the
7	beginning of the distribution process. It is
8	not like stealing a Polo shirt or a magazine or
9	candy. You are really talking serious, major
10	league theft.
11	REP. JAMES: Well, tell me, what is the
12	violation now?
13	MS. KRUEGER: There is no violation.
14	MR. STEVENSON: There is no violation.
15	REP. MANDERINO: How about for
16	knock-off Guci watches? I mean, isn't that
17	something that you make one template and you can
18	reproduce hundreds and thousands of them? I
19	mean, that might be a
20	MS. KRUEGER: Yeah, that's trademark.
21	REP. MANDERINO: You know, but that
22	might be a comparable area to look at.

MR. STEVENSON:

that's primarily done overseas as opposed to

those which are done right in our back yards and

But that is done,

23

24

1	that's
2	REP. MANDERINO: I am sorry, Mr.
3	Chairman. I am out of order.
4	CHAIRMAN GANNON: Why don't we let
5	Representative James finish up and then you can
6	go back.
7	Go ahead, Representative James.
8	REP. JAMES: I have no problem because
9	that was helpful.
10	I just think that the degree is too
11	serious for that type of offense at this time in
12	terms of putting it first offense into a felony
13	category. I think it is just, it is just not
14	I don't think that's good.
15	I also, what happens, and I was just
16	looking to see, what happens if someone buys one
17	of these bootleg tapes? Is that covered in this
18	act?
19	MS. KRUEGER: Are you saying is it a
20	crime, is it a crime to buy it?
21	REP. JAMES: Right.
22	MS. KRUEGER: No.
23	REP. JAMES: Okay. That's all I have
24	at this time. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you,

1 Representative James. 2 Representative Wogan. 3 REP. WOGAN: I have no questions, Mr. 4 Chairman. 5 CHAIRMAN GANNON: Representative 6 Maitland. 7 REP. MAITLAND: I just want to thank you for your testimony. And maybe in relation 8 9 with what Representative James is saying, we can 10 make it a felony if someone has duplicating 11 equipment, but a misdemeanor and then if they 12 are making it for their own use in some way. 13 Just throw that out. 14 CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you. 15 Representative Manderino, you had some 16 other comments? 17 REP. MANDERINO: I am sorry, Mr. 18 Chairman. I apologize to the members and to the 19 panelists, too. I got too excited, kind of 20 understanding where Representative James was 21 going. And I was just, my mind was spinning

now. And knowing that we have, while you may be correct in saying it is not like a retail theft where you steal the jacket and it is only one

with parallel examples of what we have right

1	jacket, I guess we have, it is more like a
2	trademark theft where you steal the idea or the
3	concept and you make lots of them. And so I was
4	just more for the area of the committee that
5	that is another area that we may look at how are
6	we treating that now and is that working and is
7	what we are proposing here comparable or more
8	stiff. That was my comment.
9	CHAIRMAN GANNON: Anybody?
10	REP. JAMES: Mr. Chairman?
11	CHAIRMAN GANNON: Representative James.
12	REP. JAMES: Jim, I thank you.
13	One other comment. Has there been any
14	thought of that the people in the movie theatres
15	are participating in this?
16	MR. PARKER: Do you mean employees of
17	the theatre itself?
18	REP. JAMES: Yes.
19	MR. PARKER: Who may know that?
20	REP. JAMES: Right.
21	MR. PARKER: Someone who runs the
22	projection booth and so forth?
23	REP. JAMES: Right, right. Because I
24	saw the bootleg tapes and they look real good.
25	You know, it has to come from somebody that is

in the theatre.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. PARKER: That certainly is something that we have seen, that a person, employed by the theatre, has been involved in camcordering that particular presentation. Yes, that has happened. And, as of right now, though, there is no violation.

REP. JAMES: So this would cover them?

MR. PARKER: That would cover it.

But getting back to the seriousness of this aspect, the actual camcordering of that movie is the basic part of the whole criminal enterprise. Without that, the crime, there is no crime. So I think it is, you have to look at the aspects of where is it the worst part? is right at the beginning. Sure, if somebody is duplicating, and they can duplicate other things, but they can't duplicate that movie unless they start. So as far as the seriousness is concerned in class three or whatever, I think that the judge, jury, prosecuting officials, would have the ability to use it as a felony to get throughout this entire criminal enterprise. It can be a tool, but it is a very serious part of the whole crime.

-

MR. STEVENSON: I guess maybe another analogy would be, it would be just like somebody walking into the Melon Bank and stealing a hundred, 200 thousand dollars. That is comparable to camcordering a movie off a screen because it can generate those kinds of dollars.

REP. JAMES: You know, I --

MR. STEVENSON: In terms of our asset, I guess is what I am saying. You know, we consider each particular movie that our companies produce as a business, especially when you are investing \$50 million. It takes a long time to get a return on that investment. And when our asset, our only asset is being recorded and then duplicated over and over and over again, those are all lost, potentially lost sales, rentals, people going to the movie theatre, and that is the only way we can make our money.

REP. JAMES: We also, when someone goes into a bank and robs it or takes the money, that is a violent crime and it has the potential to hurt other people or someone that could lose their life. That is not the same as someone doing a video of a movie.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. STEVENSON: I guess I should have been clear. I was thinking more of somebody that didn't come in a gun, but somebody that got into the vault and stole the money. I certainly agree with you.

REP. JAMES: You may be talking about the manager that would take the money out, or a bookkeeper.

I am sorry, I should MR. STEVENSON: have been more clear. I agree with you.

REP. JAMES: But I just think that if you, I understand what the problem is and I think something needs to be done about it, but I think it is just extremely outrageous to charge somebody with a felony for a personal offense. And I think that we have to, we need to look at it to say that if you are making it a misdemeanor and if the investigators can prove that this is a big business, then you raise it, raise it, based on it. And I think we have got some laws that can cover that kind of thing that we can deal with. Hopefully that are going to deal with it.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you, Representative.

What happens today, for example, the movie house owner, or manager, whatever, he finds somebody in the theatre videoing one of these first-run movies, what happens today?

MR. PARKER: In most cases, if the manager cares, he can ask the person to stop recording. He can ask the person to leave, I think, if he thought that that person is carrying out an activity on his premises that is something he doesn't want to happen.

I think, in most cases right now, the movie theatre owners or managers don't want to get involved. They see somebody doing something and say, well, what recourse do I have? So I think, in most cases right now, nothing happens.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Well, assuming that this became law, what would be the incentive for the owner of the movie house or the manager to get involved now?

MS. KRUEGER: Well, the first thing is, they could call the police and know that they would come, there is a violation there, there is something that actually was being committed that was against the law and they could call someone

to come and do something about it. Certainly, they could still ask them to stop and leave if that is the way they chose, but, more importantly, they have a stronger recourse; and they can also take the tape, they can seize the tape.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: When you have the situation where the pirated film gets out there and the quality is bad and somebody puts some material on there there that was inappropriate, do you get complaints? In other words, people go to the legitimate producers and say I got this bad video here and they are looking for you to redress something they bought from the black market, do you have instances of that?

MR. PARKER: Yes, we certainly do.

Some of the public is gullible. They do buy

Guci watches for 25 or 50 bucks and become

disappointed when their wrist turns green. Some

buy 007 on the street knowing that it just came

out in the theatre and think that it is a

legitimate tape and when they get half way

through it and the tape breaks, they do call the

studios or they do call the Motion Picture

Association and say something is wrong here, I

have been robbed, I have been cheated, what are you going do about it? Yes, we do get those complaints.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: What about, you mentioned foreign countries. Are you seeing any instances where some foreign countries that don't respect the copy right laws are actually exporting their pirated copies to our country or other countries? In other words, is this becoming an international business to steal one of these first-run productions and then video it and then take it and copy it and try to export it or sell it abroad?

MR. STEVENSON: I don't think there is any government that actually that we have knowledge of that is involved directly. I mean, we are in very cordial negotiations with most countries, particularly in the Far East where piracy is rampant. China is a huge problem for a number of different reasons, but we have ongoing talks with them at this point. But there are people within those countries that, you know, do have influence, upon government officials, where the activity continues.

Russia is a major, major problem. In

fact, about a year, I guess it was about a year and a half ago, Jack Valenti, through Mickie Kantor's office, through the United States trade representative, we will just not export anything at this time because of the fact that it is 100 percent pirated tapes. I mean, in the theatres, on the street corners, in retail outlets. And I don't think that situation has changed.

But the more we can do, in terms of foreign markets, is to demonstrate that we are taking care of business at home, the easier it is for us.

I mean, in Washington, it was horrible. Last summer, there were pirates on every street corner and we were getting calls from embassies, from the U.S. trade representative. You know, you name it. The studios obviously. And most of those tapes were being made in Philadelphia and being shipped into Washington.

MR. PARKER: Excuse me, sir. We did clean up the streets in Washington this year.

MR. STEVENSON: That's true, we did.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Now, under existing law, what are the tools now that you have to you say clean this up? What are you acting under?

There was no law in the 1 MR. PARKER: 2 District of Columbia prohibiting the sale other 3 than the federal law. And the bureau, the FBI, 4 would not investigate these because it didn't 5 meet the certain thresholds that had been set 6 forth by the U.S. Attorney's Office. So the law was put into effect about videocassettes, and it 8 basically is attributing the redress section. 9 And then later on, the camcordering aspect of it 10 was enacted. Therefore, that gave the District, 11 the Metropolitan Police Department, the tool to 12 use in removing these offending items from the 13 vendors' booths. They knew it was there, but 14 there was no violation of any District of 15 Columbia statute. So that gave us the tools, we 16 were able to help them and provide the manpower 17 and provide them with probable cause necessary 18 to either effect an arrest or make a seisure of

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Are there any particular movie houses that you see this occurs on a regular basis? I mean, for example, do you have a premiere movie and then is that where they most, most of the activity is focused?

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the illegal tapes.

MR. PARKER: I can't say that they come

from any particular theatre. There are certainly some that we suspect more than others, but we have only identified probably two or three, and we can't show any pattern at this point.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you. Just a comment. Representative James had, I thought his concern was, it was well expressed. But right now in the retail theft law, we go to a third degree felony and it is principally based on the amount of the offense. And my analogy here would be, I can understand some concern if we are talking about stealing one T-shirt, tucking it under your jacket and walking out. This is almost analogous to stealing a truckload of T-shirts.

MS. KRUEGER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: You know, a couple of thousand T-shirts in that truck may be worth substantial more money, I think that's what the reasoning was behind the more extreme penalty. Because I would think that if I am looking at a hundred and fifty dollar fine for doing this, that is just the cost of doing business if I get caught.

MR. STEVENSON: (Nods head affirmatively.)

CHAIRMAN GANNON: It is just like these drug runners: they lose a hundred thousand dollar boat, that is just the cost of doing business, they go out and buy another boat and start their running all over again. So my concern would be, that seems like an insignificant act, just going in and taking. These aren't family vacation films. They are out there looking to make a substantial amount of money for just one, you know, have one service operate significantly. It has great consequences for people.

Particularly, my concern is not so much for the movie stars who make livings, I am thinking of: I got a couple of video stores in my district and these people have made a big investment. They hire people and they have a big investment in their buildings and they pay taxes and somebody out on the street corner is undermining them by selling these tapes for 10 bucks instead of people going into the rental stores and so I see that impact directly on the people I represent. It is ridiculousness. And

I have talked to them and they say, yeah, we have a problem with this. You know, they get a first-run movie and people say, oh, I don't want to rent it, I have already seen it. And they pay a substantial amount of money to have the rights to rent those films.

Thank you.

Wogan.

Any other questions from anyone?

REP. WOGAN: Mr. Chairman, if I may?

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Yes, Representative

REP. WOGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman asked a question, what sort of statutes were we using to prosecute people who were dealing in bootleg tapes, discs, whatever, and the answer really centered on what was going on in Washington, D.C. But isn't it true that there are prosecutions in Pennsylvania? Because I have run into them, I have seen them in courtrooms. In fact, if my memory serves me correctly, I believe the State Attorney General's Office is often involved in these prosecutions and not local county prosecutors. And I thought maybe you could, just from the little that I know about watching

segments of these cases in courtrooms, it appears that they are very difficult to prosecute and it requires a great deal of resources on the part of the law enforcement agencies.

Because one case I did have some familiarity with, I understand that agents of the State Attorney General's Office had to actually have this center of bootlegging where you are, I guess, distributing the tapes, under surveillance for several weeks and had to catalog who was coming in and had wire stamps and everything. And if my memory serves me correctly, I think this was a group of Palestinians, who were not even American citizens. And I am wondering if you can tell us maybe a little bit about the difficulties that are presented to prosecutors, because obviously there are reasons some statutes, which are probably inadequate.

I mean, I think that you are suggesting here, this bill is an excellent bill. And I will vote for this, both in committee and on the House floor. But maybe it would help us on the House floor and also in committee if we

understood some of the real difficulties the prosecutors and law enforcement officials have in trying to attack this bootlegging problem.

MR. STEVENSON: Let me answer the first part of your question and then I will let Phil comment on the law enforcement aspects.

Basically, Pennsylvania was one of the first states to enact what Karin referred to earlier as the true name and address statute which we have been able to work with law enforcement throughout the state to be able to prosecute people that were duplicating and bootlegging videocassettes. And I think Phil has indicated some of the arrests and you have alluded to them, also. So there is something on the books right now that we are able to do within the Commonwealth.

Beyond that, what we are looking for here is additional tools to deal with an ever growing problem and new problems in terms of camcordering.

And you are right, in terms of the difficulties and so forth, and I will let Phil comment on that. But, yes. And, I mean, you all have been very supportive in that effort,

both in terms of passing legislation early on and law enforcement being cooperative with this, you know, when they can, in terms of being able to effect arrests.

One other thing I might want to say is, we have, Phil's part of it, you know, half of our organization is devoted to investigating and bringing to law enforcement these cases. Our utilization of law enforcement time is minimal. Essentially, we are the back office operation to effect those. Because, obviously, you know law enforcement has a lot to do in Pennsylvania with other more serious offenses. But, at the same time, we need additional tools because this problem has gotten way out of hand.

MR. PARKER: I didn't mention, I am retired from the FBI, I retired in 1986 as Deputy Assistant Director. All of our field representatives are retired FBI special agents or retired state troopers, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, throughout the United States. Our goal, when we get a complaint, is either civil action against a particular party or a criminal action.

When we see a criminal enterprise

ongoing, that is something that we want to take down as a, through the efforts of either the FBI, the state, or the local police. We tell the police -- whoever they are -- at the beginning that we are conducting an investigation into the activities of someone. The first reason is, we want to be up front with the law enforcement organization; and, two, we don't want to go in and screw up some investigation that they may already have ongoing.

We find that these people are getting more violent, everyone is alert for weapons that these people are carrying now and it is more and more prevalent.

And, Representative, I don't know if this is the case which you are speaking of? In Upper Darby, we had, I think there were 12 arrests and several, tens of thousands of videocassettes that were seized.

REP. WOGAN: This was a Philadelphia case.

MR. PARKER: A Philadelphia case.

Well, I don't know of any cases that we have used wire taps or -- certainly not the MPA.

But the state police or local or FBI, I don't know of any case that has required that degree of intrusion. We can normally develop the probable cause, satisfy the prosecuting attorney, whether it is the District Attorney's Office or the State Office, and go from there.

So the time that is necessary for the Pennsylvania law enforcement organization to put into these investigations is really minimal.

Our guys go out and do the leg work, take it to the state police or local police and then it is basically a package that they can work with from that moment on.

They trust, we have built up a trust with them, they trust us, they know that we are, we have no reason to go in and screw up the case so it is very meticulous in our approach and honest and forthright on all of them. Without that trust, which we have done throughout the United States, we are not any good to anybody. I hope that answers part of it.

MS. KRUEGER: If I can just add one more thing?

REP. WOGAN: Thank you.

MS. KRUEGER: I think the real

1	importance of this legislation, in adding to
2	what is already there, is that it really, it
3	increases the penalties so that people, once you
4	get one of these guys off the street, it is
5	going to keep them off the street for a while;
6	and, to hopefully stop, you know, more
7	dramatically cut down on those that are out
8	there doing this, as opposed to right now, where
9	it is just, as the Chairman said, the cost of
10	doing business; bam, they are out again the next
11	day doing it. So the real, you know, the push
12	on this is that it is going to make a difference
13	and dramatically cut back.
14	REP. WOGAN: Thank you very much.
15	Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
16	CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you,
17	Representative Wogan.

Representative Wogan.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Any other representatives, questions? (No response.)

Thank you very much CHAIRMAN GANNON: for coming today and presenting this information and handling some of the questions from the committee members. It has been very enlightening, and we are going to work on this bill and bring it up to the committee for

1	consideration in a very short period of time.
2	Thank you.
3	MR. STEVENSON: Thank you, Mr.
4	Chairman.
5	MR. PARKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
6	MS. KRUEGER: Thank you.
7	CHAIRMAN GANNON: Could you do me a
8	favor? You had some written comments, could you
9	hand them to stenographer so she can attach it
10	to the transcript? It is in the statement, In
11	Support of Pennsylvania House Bill 2295; and a
12	letter from the Recording Industry Association
13	of America. We will add these as exhibits to
14	the testimony. Thank you for the testimony.
15	(Whereupon, the public hearing was
16	adjourned at 1:25 p.m.)
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

and evidence are contained fully and accur in the notes taken by me on the within proceedings, to the best of my ability, and this copy is a correct transcript of the se Roy Crass Roy Crass		
in the notes taken by me on the within proceedings, to the best of my ability, and this copy is a correct transcript of the se Roxy Cressler, Report Notary Public Notary Public Notary Public Proceedings, to the best of my ability, and this copy is a correct transcript of the se Notary Public Notary Public 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	1	I hereby certify that the proceedings
proceedings, to the best of my ability, and this copy is a correct transcript of the set of my ability, and this copy is a correct transcript of the set of my ability, and this copy is a correct transcript of the set of my ability, and this copy is a correct transcript of the set of my ability, and this copy is a correct transcript of the set of my ability, and this copy is a correct transcript of the set of my ability, and this copy is a correct transcript of the set of my ability, and this copy is a correct transcript of the set of my ability, and this copy is a correct transcript of the set of my ability, and this copy is a correct transcript of the set of my ability, and this copy is a correct transcript of the set of my ability, and this copy is a correct transcript of the set of my ability, and this copy is a correct transcript of the set of my ability, and this copy is a correct transcript of the set of my ability, and this copy is a correct transcript of the set of my ability, and this copy is a correct transcript of the set of my ability, and the set of my ability is a correct transcript of the set of my ability, and the set of my ability is a correct transcript of the set of my ability, and the set of my ability is a correct transcript of the set of my ability is a correct transcript of the set of my ability is a correct transcript of the set of my ability is a correct transcript of the set of my ability is a correct transcript of the set of my ability is a correct transcript of the set of my ability is a correct transcript of the set of my ability is a correct transcript of the set of my ability is a correct transcript of my ability is a correct transcript of my ability is a correct transcript of the set of my ability is a correct transcript of my ability is a correct transcri	2	and evidence are contained fully and accurately
this copy is a correct transcript of the second transcript of transcript	3	in the notes taken by me on the within
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 Roxy Cressler, Report 13 Notary Public 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	4	proceedings, to the best of my ability, and that
7 8 9 10 11 12 Roxy Cressler, Report 13 Notary Public 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	5	this copy is a correct transcript of the same.
8 9 10 11 12 Roxy Cressler, Report 13 Notary Public 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	6	
9 10 11 12 Roxy Cressler, Report 13 Notary Public 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	7	
10 11 12 Roxy Cressler, Report 13 Notary Public 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	8	
11	9	
12 Roxy Cressler, Report 13 Notary Public 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	10	$Q = Q_1 = Q_2$
Notary Public	11	Coy Casses
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	12	Roxy Cressler, Reporter
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	13	Notary Public
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	14	
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	15	
18 19 20 21 22 23	16	
19 20 21 22 23	17	
20 21 22 23	18	
21 22 23	19	
22 23	20	
23	21	
	22	
24	23	
II	24	