same legal force as written signatures and contracts.

In concept, this change has broad support on both sides of the aisle and on both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue. This positive development would encourage electronic commercial activity and benefit both business and consumers.

Unfortunately, this bill goes beyond electronic signatures and contracts. It contains controversial provisions preempting State laws that require maintaining certain written records. It contains provisions opposed by consumer groups that would permit electronic notices and disclosures to be substituted for written notices. For these reasons, the bill failed to achieve the necessary two-thirds vote when it was considered earlier this month under suspension of the rules.

This restrictive rule we are now considering does make in order an amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE), and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), which will remove the controversial provisions of the bill and leave much needed language dealing with electronic signatures and contracts.

The rule also makes in order a bipartisan amendment that contains a number of consumer protections. The House is not served by rules which restrict the amendment process on legislation so important to the Nation's commerce. However, the two amendments which are made in order will give Members the opportunities to make meaningful changes to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

(Ms. LOFGREN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the rule makes in order the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE), along with the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO), myself, and several other individuals, which strengthens and I believe solves the consumer protection issues that were of concern to some Members.

Specifically, on the third page of the amendment, and I will quote, the amendment would provide that ''Nothing in this Act affects the content or timing of any disclosure required to be provided to any consumer under any statute, regulation, or other rule of law.'' I think that is about as broad as we can get in terms of making sure that consumer protection statutes are undisturbed by this electronic signature act.

It is my understanding that the chairman of the Committee on Commerce is disposed to favor this amendment, and I think that shows the bipartisan effort that has been underway to make sure that this electronic signature act does become law. The other important provision of the bill guarantees the consumers the right to opt into electronic records, and really an astoundingly broad provision that allows the consumer to withdraw his or her consent at any time.

So I think this is a light touch in terms of regulation, but there is a need for consistency and a general scheme for electronic commerce, as we all know.

I am hopeful that Members will read the language of the Inslee amendment, along with the underlying bill, so they can assure themselves, as I have been assured, that this is a fair measure that will promote e-commerce and will do no harm to other important issues. Please do read the amendment, instead of just listening to the arguments.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say very briefly that this is a bill that clearly moves us forward and recognizes e-trade and so forth. With that, I would urge the Members to support the rule and the underlying legislation.

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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on H.R. 1714.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

ELECTRONIC SIGNATURES IN GLOBAL AND NATIONAL COMMERCE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 366 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. 1714.

The Chair designates the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA) as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and requests the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) to assume the chair temporarily.

□ 1226

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. 1714) to facilitate the use of electronic records and signatures in interstate or foreign commerce, with Mr. HASTINGS of Washington (Chairman pro tempore) 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 Virginia (Mr. BLILEY) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY).

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

Mr. Chairman, last Monday the Committee on Commerce brought H.R. 1714, the Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act, to the floor under suspension of the rules.

Unfortunately, H.R. 1714 fell just four short votes of passage. The Clinton administration and minority leadership of this body mounted an intense lobbying campaign against the bill. We were proud of the number of votes that we were able to achieve in support of the bill, and we return to the House floor this week with the identical bill that was considered last Monday.

We remain confident that H.R. 1714 is strong legislation that helps to facilitate e-commerce in the new economy. This bill is perhaps the most important pro-technology vote that this Congress will take. It should not fall prey to partisan battles.

The Committee on Commerce unanimously, Mr. Chairman, unanimously voted this bill out of the committee this summer with support from both sides of the aisle. Since that time, we have worked closely with the minority leadership of the committee to craft the additional consumer protection provisions that appear in the bill considered last week and remain in the bill today.

We believe those negotiations to be fair and worthwhile, and were disappointed to learn for the first time on the floor last week that the minority did not feel the same. These important new provisions offer consumers strong protection in the electronic world. They require consumers to opt in if they wish to receive their documents in electronic form.

Let me repeat, nothing, nothing in this bill requires consumers to receive documents electronically against their wishes. Further, the bill requires that all consumers must receive important notices that may affect health or safety in the traditional paper form. This includes notices of such as the termination of utility service, cancellation of health benefits or life insurance, and foreclosure or eviction from a residence.

I would like to take this opportunity to rebut some of the charges and unfounded attacks that were made by my colleagues across the aisle when this bill was brought to the floor last week.

We heard that under H.R. 1714, consumers would be forced to accept electronic documents, even if the consumer