H. R. 3220

To regulate interstate commerce by electronic means by permitting and encouraging the continued expansion of electronic commerce through the operation of free market forces, and for other purposes.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NOVEMBER 4, 1999

Mr. Gephardt (for himself, Mr. Dingell, and Mr. Conyers) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned

A BILL

To regulate interstate commerce by electronic means by permitting and encouraging the continued expansion of electronic commerce through the operation of free market forces, and for other purposes.

- 1 Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-
- 2 tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,
- 3 SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.
- 4 This Act may be cited as the "Millennium Digital
- 5 Commerce Act".

1 SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

- 2 The Congress makes the following findings:
- 3 (1) The growth of electronic commerce and 4 electronic government transactions represent a pow-5 erful force for economic growth, consumer choice, 6 improved civic participation and wealth creation.
 - (2) The promotion of growth in private sector electronic commerce through Federal legislation is in the national interest because that market is globally important to the United States.
 - (3) A consistent legal foundation, across multiple jurisdictions, for electronic commerce will promote the growth of such transactions, and that such a foundation should be based upon a simple, technology neutral, nonregulatory, and market-based approach.
 - (4) The Nation and the world stand at the beginning of a large scale transition to an information society which will require innovative legal and policy approaches, and therefore, States can serve the national interest by continuing their proven role as laboratories of innovation for quickly evolving areas of public policy, provided that States also adopt a consistent, reasonable national baseline to eliminate obsolete barriers to electronic commerce such as undue paper and pen requirements, and further, that any

- such innovation should not unduly burden inter-jurisdictional commerce.
 - (5) To the extent State laws or regulations do not provide a consistent, reasonable national baseline or in fact create an undue burden to interstate commerce in the important burgeoning area of electronic commerce, the national interest is best served by Federal preemption to the extent necessary to provide such consistent, reasonable national baseline or eliminate said burden, but that absent such lack of a consistent, reasonable national baseline or such undue burdens, the best legal system for electronic commerce will result from continuing experimentation by individual jurisdictions.
 - (6) With due regard to the fundamental need for a consistent national baseline, each jurisdiction that enacts such laws should have the right to determine the need for any exceptions to protect consumers and maintain consistency with existing related bodies of law within a particular jurisdiction.
 - (7) Industry has developed several electronic signature technologies for use in electronic transactions, and the public policies of the United States should serve to promote a dynamic marketplace within which these technologies can compete. Con-

sistent with this Act, States should permit the use and development of any authentication technologies that are appropriate as practicable as between private parties and in use with State agencies.

5 SEC. 3. PURPOSES.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- The purposes of this Act are—
 - (1) to permit and encourage the continued expansion of electronic commerce through the operation of free market forces rather than proscriptive governmental mandates and regulations;
 - (2) to promote public confidence in the validity, integrity and reliability of electronic commerce and online government under Federal law;
 - (3) to facilitate and promote electronic commerce by clarifying the legal status of electronic records and electronic signatures in the context of contract formation;
 - (4) to facilitate the ability of private parties engaged in interstate transactions to agree among themselves on the appropriate electronic signature technologies for their transactions; and
 - (5) to promote the development of a consistent national legal infrastructure necessary to support of electronic commerce at the Federal and State levels within areas of jurisdiction.

1 SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

2 In this Act:

- 3 (1) ELECTRONIC.—The term "electronic"
 4 means relating to technology having electrical, dig5 ital, magnetic, wireless, optical, electromagnetic, or
 6 similar capabilities.
 - (2) ELECTRONIC AGENT.—The term "electronic agent" means a computer program or an electronic or other automated means used to initiate an action or respond to electronic records or performances in whole or in part without review by an individual at the time of the action or response.
 - (3) ELECTRONIC RECORD.—The term "electronic record" means a record created, generated, sent, communicated, received, or stored by electronic means.
 - (4) ELECTRONIC SIGNATURE.—The term "electronic signature" means an electronic sound, symbol, or process attached to or logically associated with a record and executed or adopted by a person with the intent to sign the record.
 - (5) GOVERNMENTAL AGENCY.—The term "governmental agency" means an executive, legislative, or judicial agency, department, board, commission, authority, or institution of the Federal Government

- or of a State or of any county, municipality, or other political subdivision of a State.
- 3 (6) Record.—The term "record" means infor-4 mation that is inscribed on a tangible medium or 5 that is stored in an electronic or other medium and 6 is retrievable in perceivable form.
- 7 (7) TRANSACTION.—The term "transaction"
 8 means an action or set of actions relating to the con9 duct of commerce, between 2 or more persons, nei10 ther of which is the United States Government, a
 11 State, or an agency, department, board, commission,
 12 authority, or institution of the United States Gov13 ernment or of a State.
- 14 (8) UNIFORM ELECTRONIC TRANSACTIONS
 15 ACT.—The term "Uniform Electronic Transactions
 16 Act" means the Uniform Electronic Transactions
 17 Act as provided to State legislatures by the National
 18 Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Law
 19 in the form or any substantially similar variation.

20 SEC. 5. INTERSTATE CONTRACT CERTAINTY.

- 21 (a) In General.—In any transaction affecting inter-
- 22 state commerce, a contract may not be denied legal effect
- 23 or enforceability solely because an electronic signature or
- 24 electronic record was used in its formation.

1 (b) Methods.—Parties to a transaction are permitted to determine the appropriate electronic signature 3 technologies for their transaction, and the means of implementing such technologies. 5 Presentation OFCONTRACTS.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), if a law requires that a contract be in writing, the legal effect, or enforceability of an elec-8 tronic record of such contract shall be denied under such law, unless it is delivered to all parties in a form that— 10 (1) can be retained by all parties for later ref-11 erence; and 12 (2) can be used to prove the terms of the agree-13 ment. 14 (d) Specific Exclusions.—The provisions of this 15 section shall not apply to a statute, regulation, or other rule of law governing any of the following: 16 17 (1) The Uniform Commercial Code, as in effect 18 in a State, other than section 1–107 and 1–206, ar-19 ticle 2, and article 2A. 20 (2) Premarital agreements, marriage, adoption, 21 divorce or other matters of family law. 22 (3) Documents of title which are filed of record 23 with a governmental unit until such time that a 24 State or subdivision thereof chooses to accept filings

electronically.

| 1 | (4) Residential landlord-tenant relationships. |
|----|---|
| 2 | (5) The Uniform Health-Care Decisions Act as |
| 3 | in effect in a State. |
| 4 | (e) Electronic Agents.—A contract relating to a |
| 5 | commercial transaction affecting interstate commerce may |
| 6 | not be denied legal effect solely because its formation |
| 7 | involved— |
| 8 | (1) the interaction of electronic agents of the |
| 9 | parties; or |
| 10 | (2) the interaction of an electronic agent of a |
| 11 | party and an individual who acts on that individual's |
| 12 | own behalf or as an agent, for another person. |
| 13 | (f) Insurance.—It is the specific intent of the Con- |
| 14 | gress that this section apply to the business of insurance. |
| 15 | (g) APPLICATION IN UETA STATES.—This section |
| 16 | does not apply in any State in which the Uniform Elec- |
| 17 | tronic Transactions Act is in effect. |
| 18 | SEC. 6. PRINCIPLES GOVERNING THE USE OF ELECTRONIC |
| 19 | SIGNATURES IN INTERNATIONAL TRANS- |
| 20 | ACTIONS. |
| 21 | To the extent practicable, the Federal Government |
| 22 | shall observe the following principles in an international |
| 23 | context to enable commercial electronic transaction: |
| 24 | (1) Remove paper-based obstacles to electronic |
| 25 | transactions by adopting relevant principles from the |

- Model Law on Electronic Commerce adopted in 1996 by the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL).
 - (2) Permit parties to a transaction to determine the appropriate authentication technologies and implementation models for their transactions, with assurance that those technologies and implementation models will be recognized and enforced.
 - (3) Permit parties to a transaction to have the opportunity to prove in court or other proceedings that their authentication approaches and their transactions are valid.
- 13 (4) Take a nondiscriminatory approach to elec-14 tronic signatures and authentication methods from 15 other jurisdictions.

16 SEC. 7. STUDY OF LEGAL AND REGULATORY BARRIERS TO

17 ELECTRONIC COMMERCE.

- 18 (a) Barriers.—Each Federal agency shall, not later
- 19 than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act,
- 20 provide a report to the Director of the Office of Manage-
- 21 ment and Budget and the Secretary of Commerce identi-
- 22 fying any provision of law administered by such agency,
- 23 or any regulations issued by such agency and in effect on
- 24 the date of enactment of this Act, that may impose a bar-
- 25 rier to electronic transactions, or otherwise to the conduct

6

7

8

9

10

11

- 1 of commerce online or be electronic means. Such barriers
- 2 include, but are not limited to, barriers imposed by a law
- 3 or regulation directly or indirectly requiring that signa-
- 4 tures, or records of transactions, be accomplished or re-
- 5 tained in other than electronic form. In its report, each
- 6 agency shall identify the barriers among those identified
- 7 whose removal would require legislative action, and shall
- 8 indicate agency plans to undertake regulatory action to
- 9 remove such barriers among those identified as are caused
- 10 by regulations issued by the agency.
- 11 (b) Report to Congress.—The Secretary of Com-
- 12 merce, in consultation with the Director of the Office of
- 13 Management and Budget, shall, within 18 months after
- 14 the date of enactment of this Act, and after the consulta-
- 15 tion required by subsection (c) of this section, report to
- 16 the Congress concerning—
- 17 (1) legislation needed to remove barriers to
- electronic transactions or otherwise to the conduct of
- 19 commerce online or by electronic means; and
- 20 (2) actions being taken by the Executive
- 21 Branch and individual Federal agencies to remove
- such barriers as are caused by agency regulations or
- policies.
- (c) Consultation.—In preparing the report re-
- 25 quired by this section, the Secretary of Commerce shall

- 1 consult with the General Services Administration, the Na-
- 2 tional Archives and Records Administration, and the At-
- 3 torney General concerning matters involving the authen-
- 4 ticity of records, their storage and retention, and their
- 5 usability for law enforcement purposes.
- 6 (d) Include Findings If No Recommenda-
- 7 TIONS.—If the report required by this section omits rec-
- 8 ommendations for actions needed to fully remove identi-
- 9 fied barriers to electronic transactions or to online or elec-
- 10 tronic commerce, it shall include a finding or findings, in-
- 11 cluding substantial reasons therefore, that such removal
- 12 is impracticable or would be inconsistent with the imple-
- 13 mentation or enforcement of applicable laws.

 \bigcirc