Committee on Appropriations that has delivered for this country a surplus for us to talk about this year, has taken us out of deficit, not in 5 or 7 years as predicted but in a short 2-year period.

□ 1045

Mr. Speaker, for all the things he will be remembered for and for all the good things he has done in this body and throughout his public career, I think this Nation owes him a debt of gratitude for that most important thing of taking us out of deficit and giving us a surplus to debate this year.

The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOB LIVINGSTON) may not ever get the credit he deserves, Mr. Speaker, but I will tell my colleagues that I know it in my heart and the people of Louisiana know it in their heart: We have rarely seen a man of that kind of dedication and spirit and deep respect and love and compassion and, as was said, tolerance for different opinions represent our State than has BOB LIVINGSTON. Louisiana will miss him sorely, and on behalf of all the people of his great district, and by the way BOB leaves with not a 60 or 70 or 80 percent approval rate, Mr. Speaker. He leaves Congress with an over 90 percent approval rate. On behalf of those people in his district and the entire State of Louisiana and, I know, this great Nation, I thank my friend for all the years he gave us. God bless him and Bonnie and his family.

Mr. Speaker, I want to wish the gentleman from Louisiana the great Cajun wish of joie de vie. I hope his life is full of joy, that his life is rich and that the retirement he justly deserves is one that he and his family will fully enjoy.

Again, BOB, thank you. God bless you.

CONGRATULATIONS ON A JOB WELL DONE

(Mr. YOUNG of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am saddened by this day because we are saying an official farewell to a very dear friend and a very distinguished Member of this House, and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LIVINGSTON) and I have served together on the Committee on Appropriations for many years. We served on the same subcommittee and sat side-by-side. And I can tell my colleagues that here is a man who is totally honest. What you see is what he is. When he says something, we can depend on it. He is not afraid to buck the tide of public opinion, if that need be the case on a given occasion, in order to stand for what his conscience tells him is right, for what his convictions tell him is right.

Mr. Speaker, he is an example for people in public life to follow through his dedication to the constituents that he represented, his dedication to the country, the entire United States of America and his willingness to stand up and take whatever heat was necessary to do what he felt was right for America.

Personally, I will miss BOB LIVINGSTON, and I hope that he will feel free to stay in touch with this Member and, I think, with all of us, because he has been a good friend, and he has been an outstanding Member. And he became Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations when many of us had never ever served in the majority before, and we were wondering:

What do we do next?

Mr. Speaker, of all the things that have to be done in a Congress, appropriations bills have to pass. Those are the things that have to be done. And BOB LIVINGSTON, as the new chairman and the first Republican chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in 40 years, had a major, major task and a major responsibility, and he had problems not only in the House within his own party on occasion. But he stood tall, and he stood strong, and he guided this appropriations process for those 4 years in such a way that most of us thought never would work.

To the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LIVINGSTON) I say:

Congratulations on a job well done. Your friends will miss you dearly, and that comes from our heart.

WIRELESS PRIVACY ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 1999

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 77 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 77

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 514) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to strengthen and clarify prohibitions on electronic eavesdropping, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 4(a) of rule XIII are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Each section of the bill shall be considered as read. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose and in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 77 is an open rule providing for consideration of H.R. 514, the Wireless Privacy Enhancement Act, a bill that will improve wireless communication privacy and make it more difficult for scanners to be altered for unlawful purposes. H. Res. 77 is a wide-open rule providing 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Commerce.

The rule waives points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 4(a) of Rule 13 which requires a 3-day layover for committee reports, and the rule provides that each section of the bill shall be considered as read.

H. Res. 77 further allows the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to accord priority in recognition to those Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD prior to their consideration. The rule also allows the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone recorded votes and to reduce to 5 minutes the voting time on any postponed question provided voting time on the first in any series of questions is not less than 15 minutes. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions, as is the right of the minority.

Mr. Speaker, when an American citizen picks up his telephone, we want to believe that the right to privacy is protecting us. Unfortunately, the rapid advance of technology permits the interception of phone calls rather easily, and relatively simple modifications to devices can provide anyone with an electronic stocking device. The bill before us today is designed to ensure that the current penalties for intercepting and divulging communications are strengthened.

It is important to note that many consumers are not even aware that current penalties even exist, and current law unfortunately encourages a relaxed attitude among those who casually intercept communications. As a result, this bill will improve the enforcement of privacy laws by increasing penalties

for violators and encouraging the use of warning labels by the manufacturers of scanners and parts.

The bill also addresses the concern that current prohibitions on the manufacture of scanners capable of receiving cellular frequencies do not extend to other wireless technology such as personal communications and paging services. In addition, current statutes require both interception and divulgence of communications to trigger a violation, which again engenders a relaxed attitude among those that intercept communications. To fix the weakness in the current statute, H.R. 514 will protect privacy and provide effective enforcement mechanisms.

A point of concern has been made about police, fire and other emergency service communications, and I do believe that the assistance of the emergency service personnel should not be interrupted. It is my understanding that language in the committee report will explain that nothing in the bill is intended to interfere with the lawful reception of these emergency communications.

Finally, I want to congratulate the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON) for her hard work in drafting this legislation. She has played an instrumental role in guiding this bill through the committee process and deserves special recognition for leadership on this issue. I certainly expect that her management of this bill on the House floor today will ensure its passage with the support of an overwhelming majority of Members.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 514 will directly improve wireless communications privacy, and this legislation was approved by the Committee on Commerce without amendment by voice vote. We will have ample time to discuss the merits of the bill during the general debate later today.

This is a fair rule, and I urge my colleagues to support it so that we may proceed with general debate and consideration of this bipartisan bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, today will be the last day of service of my aide on the Committee on Rules Thomas Bantle who came with me from our hometown in 1986, and during those years Tom has served with great distinction in my office and for the people of the 28th congressional district. But also during the time that I was the Chair of the Organization, Study and Review Committee, he had a great impact on the rules of the House, and I want to thank him for the great service that he is given me with integrity and faithfulness and wish him the very best in his new post.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER), for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I rise in support of this open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 514, the Wireless Privacy Enhancement Act.

Similar legislation passed the House in the 105th Congress by a vote of 414 to 1. While the Senate took no action on the bill, the need for this kind of privacy protection requires us to move ahead this year in the hopes that the legislation can soon become law.

Mr. Speaker, current legislation provides protection for some older technology wireless communications, but this bill extends that protection to newer technology including digital wireless communication. In addition, the bill requires the Federal Communications Commission to step up its enforcement actions against the violations of the newly-expanded privacy laws. H.R. 514 also prohibits the manufacture or modification of off-the-shelf radio scanners that could intercept digital cellular telephone communications, and this updates federal law to deal with the changes in technology since the 1986 Electronic Communications Protection Act became law.

Mr. Speaker, passage of this legislation might stop some of the predatory practices that threaten the privacy of millions of cellular conversations placed each and every day. I urge support of this open rule, and I support the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 77 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 514.

□ 1057

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 514) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to strengthen and clarify prohibitions on electronic eavesdropping, and for other purposes, with Mr. LAHOOD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN).

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, today we are here to protect the privacy of the near 68 million Americans who use wireless telecommunications services and the countless millions who will use those services in the future.

Privacy is important to all of us.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON) for introducing H.R. 514 and for shepherding this important bill through the Subcommittee on Telecommunications of the Committee on Commerce. I want to thank my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), and his staff, again for the excellent cooperation and again the bipartisan spirit that our committee so often shows in these telecommunication issues and other matters before our committee.

We begin our review of this issue in the 105th Congress. Two years ago the Subcommittee on Telecommunications held a hearing on wireless privacy. What our Members learned at that hearing was astonishing. Off-the-shelf scanners can be easily modified to turn them into electronic stalking devices.

□ 1100

With the clip of a wire, a scanner can pick up a cellular conversation in a nearby vicinity. In fact, we actually did that. I demonstrated the soldering of a small wire and within 3 minutes converted a scanner, a legal scanner, into an illegal listening device; and my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), helped with the demonstration by making a private telephone conversation.

We picked it up in the committee room, with his consent in advance, and we listened to him as he plotted an overthrow of the committee, a coup d'etat, and we demonstrated in fact how easy it was to listen in on somebody's private conversation.

I want everyone to know that we thwarted that coup d'etat, and we have been good friends ever since.

What our Members indeed learned was that privacy was deeply at risk in America, and although current law and FCC rules prohibit such eavesdropping, the technology was readily available to intercept cellular phone calls.

We also learned at the hearing that some people believed that the present law did not prohibit them from modifying legal scanners to turn them into eavesdropping devices. In fact, a whole modification industry had developed. It was openly advertising in print media and over the Internet, complete with easy-to-follow instructions on how to listen in on neighbors.

H.R. 514 was introduced to crack down on those modification scanners and to prevent a new scanning market from developing for new digital wireless services. The bill prohibits the modification of legal scanners for that purpose. It requires the FCC to adopt regulations that extend current protections, this is very important, to the new digital service, such as the personal communication services; protecting the paging and specialized mobile

services, the new digital so-called secure communications, to make sure they remain secure.

What our Members discovered was a residual belief out there, harkening to the early days of radio, that because the airwaves are a public good, all communications traversing over them are public as well. We discovered an almost right-to-listen mentality, and that mentality is directly inconsistent with cellular users' expectations and, of course, would hamper the growth of wireless communication services that promise so much good for our personal and our professional lives.

Our Members were disturbed by such a callousness for privacy of communications, an intent on establishing the policy that, regardless of the media, private communications deserved to remain private. H.R. 514, therefore, provides that interception alone of wireless communications is illegal. Current provisions in the Communications Act provide that an interception without divulgence is legal. In other words, eavesdropping alone is not illegal under the Communications Act today.

Divulgence alone is also prohibited. Existing Communications Act provisions prohibit a person from divulging an intercepted communications, wireless communication. While we abhor electronic stalking and the violation of privacy rights divulgence brings, we did not intend to punish unintentional behavior. We therefore prohibit in H.R. 514 only intentional interception.

The gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON), who has done such a great job on this bill, will offer an amendment today that will clarify that our intent is only to punish divulgence that is in fact intentional. The unintentional divulgence will not be punished. I thank her in advance for her efforts to safeguard the consumers' privacy, while ensuring that first amendment freedoms of the press and of free speech are not in fact hampered by our bill.

When we first began our examination 2 years ago, we were dismayed that the FCC, the most likely enforcer of violations against scanning abuses, was deferring to the FBI and the Justice Department for enforcement. These law enforcement agencies obviously have serious crimes to investigate, so often eavesdropping and divulgence of private communications violations was simply not pursued. We were surprised to hear this, despite the fact that one of our witnesses at our hearings 2 years ago, the FBI official in charge of the TWA crash investigation on Long Island, told us that FBI agents were unable to use their cellular phones during that investigation because the press was scanning and then divulging their intercepted calls when writing articles about the investigation, in fact hampering their ability to find what happened in that awful plane crash.

This illegal interception and divulgence of communications over commercial cellular services was hampering a major FBI investigation. Because of the current lack of aggressive enforcement, the bill now requires that the FCC, regardless of what other enforcement agencies are doing, that they must investigate alleged violations and in fact take action to prevent them.

H.R. 514 leaves undisturbed legitimate uses of scanners. Let me say it again for all Members. This bill does not affect the legitimate scanner, the legal scanner such as those that are used for public safety channels or listening to NASCAR communications for automobile races. Legal scanners, not modified to listen to your cellular phone, are legal today, will remain legal tomorrow. The bill only seeks to prohibit the interception of communications for services that are exclusively allocated for commercial service, for which consumers have the expectation of privacy. We believe we have successfully balanced a number of competing concerns, and I ask all Members to vote for this very good bill.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, first, I want to commend the chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN), for bringing this bill to the floor today and to thank him and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY) for the way in which the minority have been treated on this excellent bipartisan legislation.

We have crafted this bill over a couple-of-year period, and it reflects that very close consultation between majority and minority that has always characterized the Subcommittee on Telecommunications, Trade and Consumer Protection. And I want to particularly single out the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON) for her work on this legislation. She has helped us to fine-tune it in her brief time here on the committee, and she is the lead sponsor here today, and I want to thank her for her work on this legislation.

The bill that we have before us today offered by the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON) is essentially the same wireless scanner legislation that the House of Representatives overwhelmingly approved last session. No action was taken on that legislation in the Senate, and so we return early this session, under the leadership of the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN), and the chairman, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY) to approve it again in the hopes that the other body will do likewise.

There is a very important amendment that the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON) has crafted, which I think should be included. This legislation modifies the wireless scanner prohibitions contained in the Communications Act and updates them to address digital wireless technologies. The legislation clarifies our intention that legally protected conversations should not be readily available to scanner enthusiasts who buy scanners for entertainment or for other interests, but they should not be able to eavesdrop on their neighbors. It leaves available those public frequencies utilized often by police and fire and emergency service personnel for scanner hobbyists to continue listening in on.

It ensures that everyday wireless conversations, legally protected conversations, are not easily picked up and listened to.

The bill on the floor this morning has four main parts.

First, the bill extends current scanner receiver manufacturing restrictions to prevent the manufacture of scanners that are capable of intercepting communications in frequencies allocated to new wireless communications, namely personal communications services and protected paging and specialized mobile radio services.

Second, the bill prohibits the modification of scanners and requires the Federal Communications Commission to strengthen its rules to prevent the modification of scanning receivers. This is very important, because committee records from this year and last year make clear that some entities are restoring scanners that comply with the Federal Communications rules so that these scanners can obtain protected frequencies.

Third, the bill makes it illegal to intentionally intercept or divulge the content of radio communications.

Finally, penalties are increased for violations; and the legislation requires the Commission to move expeditiously on investigations of alleged violations.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important that we point out that digital cellular, the next generation of cellular services, and digital personal communications services are less susceptible to unauthorized eavesdropping than analogue cellular that most people in our country have been using over the last decade. Yet, digital cellular and PCS are not completely immune from eavesdropping because, in a never-ending saga of technical one-upmanship, the equipment for intercepting digital calls and converting digital conversations is becoming more available and more affordable.

Currently, such digital scanners remain vastly more expensive and complex than existing off-the-shelf scanners that intercept analogue communications. However, one of the purposes of the bill is to prevent a market from developing for less expensive digital scanners by clearly prohibiting the authorization of such scanners by the Federal Communications Commission.

In the final analysis, Mr. Chairman, consumers will best be protected through a combination of the scanner provisions we are poised to approve today and the implementation of encryption technology so that consumers can encode their own conversations

and their own private data. For this reason, we must make sure that the United States encryption policy avails consumers of the opportunity to utilize the best, most sophisticated technology, so that they can help to protect themselves, and I urge the wireless industry to help make these encryption technologies available to consumers in an affordable way.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill, and I want to again commend the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY), because the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and I and the other Members on our side feel that we were very fairly treated. We feel it is a good piece of legislation. We compliment the chairman, the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON) and all involved in it.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON), a new, extremely bright new voice, on our committee and the author of the legislation.

Mrs. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, almost 70 million Americans have cellular or digital phones or those new PCS phones that have everything on them from caller IDs to voice messaging and paging all in one little phone that can fit in someone's pocket.

In America, 1997 was a milestone year. That was the first year in American history that more cordless and cell phones were sold than hard wire phones to hang on our walls or set on our telephone tables at home.

People expect the calls that we make on those little phones in our pockets to be private, because we are used to it. We are used to it on the hard line phones in our homes and in our offices, and we have a right to expect the same thing on the ones that more and more people are carrying with them, are using in their car, sometimes dangerously, or in restaurants or outside office buildings or walking down the street or on the subway. They expect privacy, and we need to give it to them.

While the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) were here in Washington busy with their soldering irons and plotting coup d'etats in the Subcommittee on Telecommunications Trade and Consumer Protection, I was back in New Mexico in my home State.

I am not really a technology person, but shortly after my baby was born, I heard voices coming from her room and went in there and found that the baby monitor was picking up the conversations of my neighbor, and while that is not exactly on point it proved to me how easy it is for technology to inadvertently pick up the private conversations of someone that thought that conversation and had a right to believe that conversation should be private.

The law in privacy has loopholes, and technology has outstripped our privacy protection laws. I would note that it was the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) in 1992 who wrote the original law here that covers cell phones, but it needs to be expanded today, and that is what this bill is all about.

We should not have companies in America advertising scanners that can be easily modified to pick up private conversations. There should not be a business for that in America, and this bill would eliminate that kind of business. The bill updates scanner manufacturing bans so that new frequencies, including digital and PCS phones are covered, in addition to cell phones. It prohibits the modification of scanners to intercept calls.

□ 1115

So there is no more messing around in the hearing room.

Mr. Chairman, it makes it illegal to intentionally intercept calls or to intentionally divulge the content of private calls, and it increases the penalties for violators and requires the FCC to investigate violations, instead of just referring them over to somebody else who is overburdened as it is.

I think it is also important to make clear what this bill does not do, because I think it can be confusing, especially for those of us who are not really used to dealing with some of these telecommunications widgets. There are a lot of people who listen to the police and fire departments on the scanners because they are volunteer firefighters or just because they like to. They like to know what is going on in their town and where they can help. There are also ham operators that enjoy their hobby, and they provide a public service, and that is okay.

It is okay now, and it will continue to be okay with this bill. Those are public service and amateur radio frequencies, and people should be able to listen to them and to use them. Just to make it perfectly clear, we have added report language to the bill that makes this intent very clear to the FCC. There will be no interference with those rights and public frequencies and the ability to have scanners for public service and fire and police.

Mr. Chairman, I will also have an amendment that clarifies that those who unintentionally divulge information that they do not know comes from an illegally intercepted conversation are not penalized. One should not be held accountable for something if they had no intention or no knowledge, and we will clarify that with an amendment in a few minutes here.

Of course, we also have to be sensitive to the needs of law enforcement agencies and national security; and the bill also, by cross-reference to Title 18 in the Criminal Code, makes clear that the procedures that exist now for fighting terrorism and drug traffickers and other criminal acts remain as they always have been.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman BLILEY) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Chairman TAUZIN), as well as the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) for working on this bill for so long and tolerating some of the tweaking that we have been doing to it. Their staffs have been very cooperative, and I think we have a good, solid piece of legislation that is supported by both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate particularly the prompt action of the gentleman from Louisiana in bringing this to the floor today. This bill will give Americans privacy they expect and they deserve, and I thank him for his leadership.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON) on behalf of all of us on the committee for the excellent job on this bill, and I look forward to working with her on many other high-tech issues as we learn them together.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Richmond, Virginia (Mr. BLILEY), who is not only the chairman of our Committee on Commerce but the chairman of what we consider to be the most important committee in the House of Representatives.

(Mr. BLILEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Chairman, yesterday, the House considered and passed the first of a couple of wireless bills and, like its brother of yesterday, the bill before us today both increases the usefulness of wireless services for our constituents and promotes an important public interest.

H.R. 514 will increase the privacy of the 70-odd million subscribers of wireless services in this country. The bill outlaws modifications of off-the-shelf scanners to intercept personal wireless communications, not communications over shared frequencies where the parties expect to be heard, like in NASCAR racing, boating or police or fire channels, but of private communications enabled by commercial services where users have an expectation of privacy.

Mr. Chairman, I remember a hearing in the last Congress when the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member put on a demonstration of just how easy it is to take an off-the-shelf scanner and modify it. Nobody has the right to listen to private communication merely because one has the technical expertise to intercept. This bill will outlaw such interception and force the FCC to deal with electronic stalking as a serious breach of our privacy rights enforceable under this new law.

The bill will also prevent the development of a market for next generation digital scanners, so that from the get-go digital wireless service will remain private.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from New Mexico

(Mrs. WILSON) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Chairman TAUZIN), as well as the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), ranking member of the subcommittee, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), ranking member of the full committee.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to also single out again the work of the staff who have always, as I said, toiled long hours to help us bring bills like this, complex in nature, technical in nature, to the floor.

I want to again acknowledge and thank Andy Levin and Colin Crowell, and from the majority, Tricia Paoletta, Mike O'Rielly, Cliff Riccio and Luke Rose for their excellent work on this bill and for our entire committee and subcommittee.

Again, I say thanks for the work of the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman BLILEY) in helping us to move this legislation to the floor, as well as to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) for their excellent cooperation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, thank you for giving me this opportunity to address this important bill, H.R. 514, that will extend our federal privacy protections to protect the users of wireless technologies.

Many historians would agree, that it is our country's long tradition of innovation and ingenuity that made us, and keeps us, a superpower. However, the rewards of innovation do not always come without a price.

First, there is the cost of developing the innovation. Our government often participates in that innovation through agencies and programs like NASA, the Science Foundation (NSF), and the Advanced Technology Program (ATP).

Second, new technologies often have hidden costs. One example is the Y2K problem, which manifested itself in part because technology developers did not believe that their products would still be in use in the 21st century.

Third and unfortunately, because the law is sometimes unable to adjust quickly enough to these rapidly-changing technologies, there are other costs that come about because of fraudulent or criminal activity. This bill addresses one such problem that has developed because of the rise in the use of wireless technologies, such as cellular phones.

With the demand for wireless technologies growing at a near-exponential rate, we have seen the development of technologies that are capable of intercepting wireless transmissions, and in some instances, decoding those transmissions. That means that with a simply modified scanner, an individual with criminal intentions could readily listen into cellular phone conversations undetectably.

Furthermore, there are some scanners that even have the ability to decode the digital transmissions that up until now were a strong selling point for high-end cellular phones. Many of the purchasers of digital phones, in fact, purchased them in part because they felt that their conversations and cellular phone profiles are more secure than with the use of analog technology.

This bill works to better protect those consumers, and in fact, all consumers of wireless technologies, by making it illegal to intentionally intercept or disclose any wireless communication. By criminalizing both behaviors, we will be protecting all consumers from the fraudulent misuse of their conversations and transmissions.

It is our responsibility as a Congress to preserve the principles put forth in our Constitution. I feel that this bill is a logical extension of the Right of Privacy recognized by the Supreme Court in *Griswold* v. *Connecticut*, 381 U.S. 479 (1965), and I support this bill as a result.

I urge all of you to vote in favor of this bill, and to further protect our citizens from high-tech fraud.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 514, and in support of the Wilson amendment. The passage of this legislation will, as does so much of the legislation we pass, move our nation yet another step close to a national police state by further expanding a federal crime and empowering more federal police—this time at the Federal Communications Commission. Despite recent and stern warnings by both former U.S. attorney general Edwin Meese III and current U.S. Supreme Court Chief Justice William H. Rehnquist, the Congress seems compelled to ride the current wave of federally criminalizing every human misdeed in the name of saving the world from some evil rather than to uphold a Constitutional oath which prescribes a procedural structure by which the nation is protected from totalitarianism.

Our federal government is, constitutionally, a government of limited powers. Article one, Section eight, enumerates the legislative areas for which the U.S. Congress is allowed to act or enact legislation. For every issue, the federal government lacks any authority or consent of the governed and only the state governments, their designees, or the people in their private market actions enjoy such rights to governance. The tenth amendment is brutally clear in stating ''The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.'' Our nation's history makes clear that the U.S. Constitution is a document intended to limit the power of central government. No serious reading of historical events surrounding the creation of the Constitution could reasonably portray it differently. Of course, there will be those who will hand their constitutional ''hats'' on the interstate commerce or general welfare clauses, both of which have been popular ''headgear'' since the plunge into New Deal Socialism.

Perhaps, more dangerous is the loss of another Constitutional protection which comes with the passage of more and more federal criminal legislation. Constitutionally, there are only three federal crimes. These are treason against the United States, piracy on the high seas, and counterfeiting (and, as mentioned above, for a short period of history, the manufacture, sale, or transport of alcohol was concurrently a federal and state crime). ''Concurrent'' jurisdiction crimes, such as alcohol prohibition in the past and eavesdropping today, erode the right of citizens to be free of double jeopardy. The fifth amendment to the U.S. Constitution specifies that no ''person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb . . .'' In other words, no person shall be tried twice for the same offense. However, in *United States v. Lanza*, the high court in 1922 sustained a ruling that being tried by both the federal government and a state government for the same offense did not offend the doctrine of double jeopardy. One danger of unconstitutionally expanding the federal justice code is that it seriously increases the danger that one will be subject to being tried twice for the same crime. Despite the various pleas for federal correction of societal wrongs, a national police force is neither prudent nor constitutional.

The argument which springs from the criticism of a federalized criminal code and a federal police force is that states may be less effective than a centralized federal government in dealing with those who leave one state jurisdiction for another. Fortunately, the Constitution provides for the procedural means for preserving the integrity of state sovereignty over those issues delegated to it via the tenth amendment. Article IV, Section 2, Clause 2 makes provision for the rendition of fugitives from one state to another. While not self-enacting, in 1783 Congress passed an act which did exactly this. There is, of course, a cost imposed upon states in working with one another rather than relying on a national, unified police force. At the same time, there is a greater cost to centralization of police power.

It is important to be reminded of the benefits of federalism as well as the costs. There are sound reasons to maintain a system of smaller, independent jurisdictions—it is called competition and governments must, for the sake of the citizenry, be allowed to compete. We have obsessed so much over the notion of ''competition'' in this country we harangue someone like Bill Gates when, by offering superior products to every other similarly-situated entity, he becomes the dominant provider of certain computer products. Rather than allow someone who serves to provide values as made obvious by their voluntary exchanges in the free market, we lambaste efficiency and economies of scale in the private marketplace. Yet, at the same time, we further centralize government, the ultimate monopoly and one empowered by force rather than voluntary exchange.

As government becomes more centralized, it becomes much more difficult to vote with one's feet to escape the relatively more oppressive governments. Governmental units must remain small with ample opportunity for citizen mobility both to efficient governments and away from those which tend to be oppressive. Centralization of criminal law makes such mobility less and less practical.

For each of these reasons, among others, I must oppose the further and unconstitutional centralization of police power in the national government and, accordingly, H.R. 514.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered under the 5-minute rule by section, and each section shall be considered read.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that has been printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a request for recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1 is as follows:

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Wireless Privacy Enhancement Act of 1999''.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 1?

The Clerk will designate section 2.

The text of section 2 is as follows:

SEC. 2. COMMERCE IN ELECTRONIC EAVESDROPPING DEVICES.

(a) PROHIBITION ON MODIFICATION.—Section 302(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 302a(b)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: '', or modify any such device, equipment, or system in any manner that causes such device, equipment, or system to fail to comply with such regulations''.

(b) PROHIBITION ON COMMERCE IN SCANNING RECEIVERS.—Section 302(d) of such Act (47 U.S.C. 302a(d)) is amended to read as follows:

''(d) EQUIPMENT AUTHORIZATION REGULATIONS.—

''(1) PRIVACY PROTECTIONS REQUIRED.—The Commission shall prescribe regulations, and review and revise such regulations as necessary in response to subsequent changes in technology or behavior, denying equipment authorization (under part 15 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, or any other part of that title) for any scanning receiver that is capable of—

''(A) receiving transmissions in the frequencies that are allocated to the domestic cellular radio telecommunications service or the personal communications service;

''(B) readily being altered to receive transmissions in such frequencies;

''(C) being equipped with decoders that—

''(i) convert digital domestic cellular radio telecommunications service, personal communications service, or protected specialized mobile radio service transmissions to analog voice audio; or

''(ii) convert protected paging service transmissions to alphanumeric text; or

''(D) being equipped with devices that otherwise decode encrypted radio transmissions for the purposes of unauthorized interception.

''(2) PRIVACY PROTECTIONS FOR SHARED FREQUENCIES.—The Commission shall, with respect to scanning receivers capable of receiving transmissions in frequencies that are used by commercial mobile services and that are shared by public safety users, examine methods, and may prescribe such regulations as may be necessary, to enhance the privacy of users of such frequencies.

''(3) TAMPERING PREVENTION.—In prescribing regulations pursuant to paragraph (1), the Commission shall consider defining 'capable of readily being altered' to require scanning receivers to be manufactured in a manner that effectively precludes alteration of equipment features and functions as necessary to prevent commerce in devices that may be used unlawfully to intercept or divulge radio communication.

''(4) WARNING LABELS.—In prescribing regulations under paragraph (1), the Commission shall consider requiring labels on scanning receivers warning of the prohibitions in Federal law on intentionally intercepting or divulging radio communications.

''(5) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this subsection, the term 'protected' means secured by an electronic method that is not published or disclosed except to authorized users, as further defined by Commission regulation.''.

(c) IMPLEMENTING REGULATIONS.—Within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Communications Commission shall prescribe amendments to its regulations for the purposes of implementing the amendments made by this section.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 2?

The Clerk will designate section 3.

The text of section 3 is as follows:

SEC. 3. UNAUTHORIZED INTERCEPTION OR PUBLICATION OF COMMUNICATIONS.

Section 705 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 605) is amended—

(1) in the heading of such section, by inserting ''**INTERCEPTION or**'' after ''**UNAUTHORIZED**'';

(2) in the first sentence of subsection (a), by striking ''Except as authorized by chapter 119, title 18, United States Code, no person'' and inserting ''No person'';

(3) in the second sentence of subsection (a)—

(A) by inserting ''intentionally'' before ''intercept''; and

(B) by striking ''and divulge'' and inserting ''or divulge'';

(4) by striking the last sentence of subsection (a) and inserting the following: ''Nothing in this subsection prohibits an interception or disclosure of a communication as authorized by chapter 119 of title 18, United States Code.'';

(5) in subsection (e)(1)—

(A) by striking ''fined not more than $2,000 or''; and

(B) by inserting ''or fined under title 18, United States Code,'' after ''6 months,''; and

(6) in subsection (e)(3), by striking ''any violation'' and inserting ''any receipt, interception, divulgence, publication, or utilization of any communication in violation'';

(7) in subsection (e)(4), by striking ''any other activity prohibited by subsection (a)'' and inserting ''any receipt, interception, divulgence, publication, or utilization of any communication in violation of subsection (a)''; and

(8) by adding at the end of subsection (e) the following new paragraph:

''(7) Notwithstanding any other investigative or enforcement activities of any other Federal agency, the Commission shall investigate alleged violations of this section and may proceed to initiate action under section 503 of this Act to impose forfeiture penalties with respect to such violation upon conclusion of the Commission's investigation.''.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 3?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. WILSON

Mrs. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. WILSON:

Page 5, strike lines 14 and 15 and insert the following:

(B) by striking ''communication and divulge'' and inserting ''communication, and no person having intercepted such a communication shall intentionally divulge'';

(4) in the fourth sentence of subsection (a)—

(A) by inserting ''(A)'' after ''intercepted, shall''; and

(B) by striking ''thereof) or'' and inserting ''thereof); or (B)'';

Page 5, line 16, strike ''(4)'' and insert ''(5)''.

Page 5, line 21, strike ''(5)'' and insert ''(6)''.

Page 6, line 1, strike ''(6)'' and insert ''(7)''.

Page 6, line 5, strike ''(7)'' and insert ''(8)''.

Page 6, line 10, strike ''(8)'' and insert ''(9)''.

Mrs. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, concern was raised during the consideration of this bill by several folks who were concerned about first amendment rights. It was a drafting point, but it needed to be fixed in order to make it perfectly clear. We do not want to make it a crime to divulge or publish information that someone does not know came from an intercepted cell call. That would criminalize unintentional acts.

Mr. Chairman, say a reporter gets a scoop from a source, not knowing that it came from an intercepted call, for example. We do not want that to be a crime, even if the interception is a crime. But we do wish to prohibit people divulging information that they know was illegally intercepted, even if they were not the ones that actually intercepted the call. If we did not do that, that would be a loophole to drive a truck through.

How could that happen? Let us say I am illegally monitoring cell calls, whether for pleasure or just systematically, and I intercept a cell call of a builder who is talking over his phone who talks about information on a bid that he is going to give on a job. I give it to my buddy, and my buddy divulges it to another builder or divulges it publicly. It should be a crime to divulge that information if one knows that it came from an intercepted call. It should be a crime for me to do it or for my buddy to do it, if he knows that I have been scanning those calls.

This amendment makes that clarification, that it is a crime to intentionally intercept. It is a crime to intentionally divulge. It is not a crime to divulge it if one does not know where the information came from. It sounds a little bit confusing, but this amendment will protect first amendment rights while criminalizing eavesdropping and those who are a part of eavesdropping schemes.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very important clarifying amendment which will protect innocent people from being swept up in a statute which is clearly aimed at wrongdoers. I want to congratulate the gentlewoman from New

Mexico (Mrs. WILSON) for this important refinement, which I think at the point of enforcement is going to be very helpful to law enforcement officials because it will make it quite clear what it was that Congress intended. I would urge all Members to support the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments to the bill?

If there are no further amendments, under the rule the committee now rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YOUNG of Florida) having assumed the chair, Mr. LAHOOD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 514) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to strengthen and clarify prohibitions on electronic eavesdropping, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 77, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 403, nays 3, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 28]

YEAS—403

Abercrombie	Bateman	Borski
Aderholt	Becerra	Boswell
Allen	Bentsen	Boucher
Andrews	Bereuter	Boyd
Archer	Berkley	Brady (PA)
Armey	Berman	Brady (TX)
Bachus	Berry	Brown (CA)
Baird	Biggert	Brown (FL)
Baker	Bilbray	Brown (OH)
Baldacci	Bilirakis	Bryant
Baldwin	Bishop	Burr
Ballenger	Blagojevich	Burton
Barcia	Bliley	Buyer
Barr	Blumenauer	Callahan
Barrett (NE)	Blunt	Calvert
Barrett (WI)	Boehlert	Camp
Bartlett	Boehner	Campbell
Barton	Bonilla	Canady
Bass	Bono	Cannon
Capuano	Hefley	Mink
Cardin	Herger	Mollohan
Carson	Hill (IN)	Moore
Castle	Hill (MT)	Moran (KS)
Chabot	Hilleary	Moran (VA)
Chambliss	Hilliard	Morella
Chenoweth	Hinojosa	Murtha
Clay	Hobson	Myrick
Clayton	Hoeffel	Nadler
Clement	Hoekstra	Napolitano
Clyburn	Holden	Neal
Coble	Holt	Nethercutt
Coburn	Hooley	Ney
Collins	Horn	Northup
Combest	Hostettler	Norwood
Condit	Houghton	Nussle
Conyers	Hoyer	Oberstar
Cook	Hulshof	Obey
Cooksey	Hunter	Olver
Costello	Hutchinson	Ortiz
Cox	Hyde	Ose
Coyne	Inslee	Owens
Cramer	Isakson	Oxley
Crane	Istook	Packard
Crowley	Jackson (IL)	Pallone
Cubin	Jackson-Lee (TX)	Pascrell
Cummings	Jefferson	Pease
Cunningham	Jenkins	Peterson (MN)
Danner	John	Peterson (PA)
Davis (FL)	Johnson (CT)	Petri
Davis (IL)	Johnson, E. B.	Phelps
Deal	Johnson, Sam	Pickering
DeFazio	Jones (NC)	Pickett
DeGette	Jones (OH)	Pitts
Delahunt	Kanjorski	Pombo
DeLauro	Kaptur	Pomeroy
DeLay	Kelly	Porter
DeMint	Kildee	Portman
Deutsch	Kilpatrick	Price (NC)
Diaz-Balart	Kind (WI)	Pryce (OH)
Dicks	King (NY)	Quinn
Dingell	Kingston	Radanovich
Dixon	Kleczka	Rahall
Doggett	Klink	Ramstad
Dooley	Knollenberg	Rangel
Doolittle	Kucinich	Reynolds
Doyle	Kuykendall	Riley
Dreier	LaFalce	Rivers
Duncan	LaHood	Rodriguez
Dunn	Lampson	Roemer
Edwards	Lantos	Rogers
Ehlers	Largent	Rohrabacher
Ehrlich	Larson	Ros-Lehtinen
Emerson	Latham	Rothman
Engel	LaTourette	Roukema
English	Lazio	Roybal-Allard
Etheridge	Leach	Ryan (WI)
Evans	Levin	Ryun (KS)
Everett	Lewis (CA)	Sabo
Ewing	Lewis (GA)	Salmon
Farr	Lewis (KY)	Sanchez
Fattah	Linder	Sanders
Filner	Lipinski	Sandlin
Fletcher	LoBiondo	Sanford
Foley	Lofgren	Sawyer
Forbes	Lowey	Saxton
Ford	Lucas (KY)	Scarborough
Fossella	Lucas (OK)	Schaffer
Fowler	Luther	Schakowsky
Franks (NJ)	Maloney (CT)	Scott
Frelinghuysen	Maloney (NY)	Sensenbrenner
Frost	Manzullo	Serrano
Gallegly	Markey	Sessions
Ganske	Martinez	Shadegg
Gejdenson	Mascara	Shaw
Gekas	Matsui	Shays
Gibbons	McCarthy (MO)	Sherman
Gilchrest	McCarthy (NY)	Sherwood
Gillmor	McCollum	Shimkus
Gilman	McCrery	Shows
Gonzalez	McGovern	Shuster
Goode	McHugh	Simpson
Goodlatte	McInnis	Sisisky
Gordon	McIntosh	Skeen
Goss	McIntyre	Skelton
Graham	McKeon	Slaughter
Granger	McKinney	Smith (MI)
Green (TX)	McNulty	Smith (NJ)
Green (WI)	Meehan	Smith (TX)
Greenwood	Meek (FL)	Smith (WA)
Gutierrez	Menendez	Snyder
Gutknecht	Metcalf	Souder
Hall (OH)	Mica	Spence
Hall (TX)	Millender-McDonald	Spratt
Hansen	Miller (FL)	Stabenow
Hastings (FL)	Miller, Gary	Stark
Hastings (WA)	Minge	Stearns
Hayes	Mink	Stenholm
Hayworth	Mollohan	Strickland
Stump	Thurman	Watts (OK)
Stupak	Tiahrt	Waxman
Sununu	Tierney	Weiner
Sweeney	Toomey	Weldon (FL)
Talent	Traficant	Weldon (PA)
Tancredo	Turner	Weller
Tanner	Udall (CO)	Wexler
Tauscher	Udall (NM)	Weygand
Tauzin	Upton	Whitfield
Taylor (MS)	Velazquez	Wicker
Taylor (NC)	Vento	Wilson
Terry	Visclosky	Wise
Thomas	Walden	Wolf
Thompson (CA)	Walsh	Wu
Thompson (MS)	Wamp	Wynn
Thornberry	Watkins	Young (AK)
Thune	Watt (NC)	Young (FL)

NAYS—3

Hinchey	McDermott	Paul

NOT VOTING—28

Ackerman	Kennedy	Regula
Bonior	Kolbe	Reyes
Capps	Lee	Rogan
Davis (VA)	Livingston	Royce
Dickey	Meeks (NY)	Rush
Eshoo	Miller, George	Towns
Frank (MA)	Moakley	Waters
Gephardt	Pastor	Woolsey
Goodling	Payne	
Kasich	Pelosi	

□ 1147

Mr. HINCHEY changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 28, I was traveling with the Chairman, Subcommittee on Africa and was unavoidably absent for the vote on H.R. 514. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, regrettably I was unavoidably detained for rollcall vote 28. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, February 25, 1999, I was unavoidably detained and unable to record a vote by electronic device on roll No. 27. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye'' on roll No. 27.

On Thursday, February 25, 1999, I was unavoidably detained and unable to record a vote by electronic device on roll No. 28. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye'' on roll No. 28.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, due to a family illness I was unable to attend votes this week. Had I been here I would have made the following votes: Rollcall No. 22—''aye''; rollcall No. 23—''aye''; rollcall No. 24—''aye''; rollcall No. 25—''aye''; rollcall No. 26—''aye''; rollcall No. 27—''aye''; rollcall No. 28—''aye''.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.