

be the Pizza Hut, could be almost anything, so you take the call and that is not what it is. In many cases they are trying to defraud our elderly in some scam or something like this. So we passed a law that we thought would handle it. But it needs to be updated, and that is what this bill does.

As has been pointed out, it makes it illegal to initiate these calls from outside the United States. It makes it illegal to do it over the Internet with a Voice Over Internet Protocol-based system. And it also broadens the jurisdiction to include text messaging.

As we well know, Mr. Speaker, text messaging is ubiquitous now on our Blackberrys and our iPads and iPhones and all of our personal telecommunication devices.

This bill has bipartisan support. The subcommittee chairman, Mr. WALDEN, is an original cosponsor. The subcommittee ranking member, Ms. ESHOO of California, is a cosponsor. Chairman Emeritus on the Democratic side JOHN DINGELL is a cosponsor. I am an original sponsor.

So this is one of these instances, Mr. Speaker, that Republicans and Democrats are united. Chairman UPTON, the full committee chairman, and Mr. WAXMAN, the full committee ranking member, are totally supportive.

□ 1830

There is every indication that, if this body passes this bill this evening, it will go to the other body, the United States Senate, and we fully expect it to pass it. This is one of those rare birds in this Congress that might actually be signed by the President of the United States.

There is no known opposition to the bill. Our stakeholders, as Mr. MATHESON has pointed out, support it. Google supports it. The FCC supports it. AT&T, CTIA, Microsoft, USTelecom, Vonage, Verizon, and AARP are just some of the more popularly known stakeholders that support the bill.

So I rise in strong support, Mr. Speaker, that we unanimously pass H.R. 3670, the Anti-Spoofing Act of 2013, and send it to the Senate for its consideration.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3670, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENHANCE LABELING, ACCESSING, AND BRANDING OF ELECTRONIC LICENSES ACT OF 2014

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill

(H.R. 5161) to promote the non-exclusive use of electronic labeling for devices licensed by the Federal Communications Commission.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5161

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 “Enhance Labeling, Accessing, and Branding of Electronic Licenses Act of 2014” or the “E-LABEL Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The Federal Communications Commission (referred to in this section as the “Commission”) first standardized physical labels for licensed products such as computers, phones, and other electronic devices in 1973, and the Commission has continually refined physical label requirements over time.

(2) As devices become smaller, compliance with physical label requirements can become more difficult and costly.

(3) Many manufacturers and consumers of licensed devices in the United States would prefer to have the option to provide or receive important Commission labeling information digitally on the screen of the device, at the discretion of the user.

(4) An electronic labeling option would give flexibility to manufacturers in meeting labeling requirements.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION FOR FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION TO ALLOW ELECTRONIC LABELING.

Title VII of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 720. OPTIONAL ELECTRONIC LABELING OF COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘electronic labeling’ means displaying required labeling and regulatory information electronically; and

“(2) the term ‘radiofrequency device with display’ means any equipment or device that—

“(A) is required under regulations of the Commission to be authorized by the Commission before the equipment or device may be marketed or sold within the United States; and

“(B) has the capability to digitally display required labeling and regulatory information.

“(b) REQUIREMENT TO PROMULGATE REGULATIONS FOR ELECTRONIC LABELING.—Not later than 9 months after the date of enactment of the Enhance Labeling, Accessing, and Branding of Electronic Licenses Act of 2014, the Commission shall promulgate regulations or take other appropriate action, as necessary, to allow manufacturers of radiofrequency devices with display the option to use electronic labeling for the equipment in place of affixing physical labels to the equipment.”

SEC. 4. SAVINGS CLAUSE.

The amendment made by section 3 shall not be construed to affect the authority of the Federal Communications Commission under section 302 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 302a) to provide for electronic labeling of devices.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material in the RECORD on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 5161, the E-LABEL Act. This legislation that I introduced is a bipartisan and bicameral measure that marks an important step forward in modernizing our laws to reflect today’s information and communications technology marketplace.

Over the past 20 years, there has been tremendous growth and innovation in both the communications and manufacturing industries. Smartphones, tablets, and other revolutionary devices come equipped with functionalities we could only imagine just a short time ago. In the midst of this innovation era, it is critical that our laws recognize these advancements and are updated to foster continued investment and opportunities for future development. The E-LABEL Act will facilitate this effort.

The E-LABEL Act establishes a timeline for the FCC to move forward with a rulemaking to permit the use of electronic labels instead of physical labels to certify that devices with screens have been approved for commercial use. Not only will this give manufacturers greater flexibility to design innovative products that consumers demand, but by some estimates, e-labeling will save manufacturers over \$80 million a year. Consumers will also benefit from efficiencies created by e-labeling. E-labeling can expand consumer access to relevant device information and enhance the overall quality and availability of equipment identification records through supporting software. The E-LABEL Act represents good policy for both manufacturers and consumers and should be advanced without delay.

I thank Ranking Member ESHOO, Congressman WELCH, and Congresswoman BLACKBURN for their support on this measure. I also thank Chairmen UPTON and WALDEN for their continued support and leadership in modernizing our communication laws for the digital age. I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

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

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 5161, the E-LABEL Act.

This bipartisan bill will modernize the Federal Communications Commission’s device certification rules by eliminating the requirement for device manufacturers to include etched labels on the outside body of each electronic

device. Instead, device manufacturers will have the flexibility to display FCC certification information through software on device screens.

There are numerous potential benefits to e-labeling. For example, e-labels can provide more information to consumers than is conveyed today, such as details regarding the device warranties, recycling, and trade-in opportunities. E-labeling will also lower production costs for device manufacturers since affixing labels to a device can require significant design time and expensive equipment.

I would also note that we should commend FCC Chairman Wheeler and his staff in the Office of Engineering and Technology for recently taking steps to update the Commission's e-labeling policies.

By working together with the FCC, we can provide innovators with more flexibility and speed the delivery of new devices in the marketplace.

I want to thank my colleague, Mr. LATTA, for his leadership on this issue, and I urge my colleagues to join me in the support of H.R. 5161, the E-LABEL Act.

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

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I would urge the House to support this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARTON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5161.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

ISLAMIC JIHAD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I am so profoundly grateful to be able to stand in the well of the United States House of Representatives. There is no greater bastion for free speech than here in this House. What a wonderful gift this is, not only just for people here in the United States, but also for people around the world.

There is one thing that we have learned from Tiananmen Square, and I had the privilege in August of being able to travel to China and visit and stand in the midst of Tiananmen Square, where people from around China had come to take a stand for speech. If we remember from that infa-

mous photo that was taken, one very brave student held up a copy of a little pamphlet in front of a tank when a tank was going to run this student over. The document that the student held up was a copy of the United States Declaration of Independence, as he spoke about freedom and what freedom meant to him.

You see, Mr. Speaker, we have always been in this country—this is a standard-bearer for liberty, a standard-bearer for freedom and a standard-bearer for the expression of free speech rights. That is why we take this opportunity so seriously to be able to keep safe this ability, to be able to speak out on the issues of the day.

If there is anything that has captured America's attention with horror, I believe, especially over these summer months as the United States Congress had taken a recess—the Members of the House of Representatives and of the United States Senate had gone back into their districts, and they had met with people on the ground who allowed them to come and serve here in this Congress—it is, when they went home, they also saw on their televisions at night a fairly horrific sight, something that we thank God with everything within our beings that we don't see frequently here in the United States. It was terrorism—and terrorism on a level that we were unfamiliar with and hadn't seen before.

We heard of a group named ISIS, and we saw they had continued to make wild gains both in Iraq and in Syria, so much so that they were robbing banks to fill their own pockets. Then they began to steal oilfields and take those oilfields over. Then they took over oil refineries. Then they began to take over electric grids. Then, with just seemingly very few men, they took over entire cities. In fact, we were shocked when the city of Mosul, which is the ancient city of Nineveh—the prophet Jonah was sent to the city of Nineveh, where he preached to the city, and the Holy Bible records that the entire city repented and turned to God. That ancient city is the modern day city of Mosul in northern Iraq. That was the city that the leader of the Islamic State—the jihadists that we have seen every night on our national news programs—chose to come against. That particular city had a population of well over a million people, and some estimate there were 1.7 million people.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would be more than delighted to yield to the wonderful gentlewoman from the great State of North Carolina, Ms. VIRGINIA FOXX.

RECOGNIZING CHILDRESS INSTITUTE FOR PEDIATRIC TRAUMA

Ms. FOXX. I want to thank the gentlewoman from Minnesota for yielding. I know she has an important message to bring tonight, and I appreciate her sharing a little of her time with me.

Mr. Speaker, at a recent event, I had the privilege of learning more about a remarkable organization in Winston-

Salem, North Carolina—the Childress Institute for Pediatric Trauma at Wake Forest Baptist Medical Center. The institute was established due to the leadership and generous financial support of Richard and Judy Childress, who saw that, while trauma was taking the lives of thousands of children every year, pediatric trauma was not a focus of medical research.

In 2010, according to the Centers for Disease Control, pediatric trauma took the lives of 9,523 children, making it the largest cause of childhood death by a significant margin. As a comparison, cancer, heart disease, and birth defects combined take the lives of about 3,300 children every year. Tragically, 3,300 is a very similar number of children who were killed in 2010 due to traumatic injury from child abuse. An additional 6,190 children died that year from unintentional traumatic injuries. A full 52 percent of those injuries were caused by vehicle accidents, followed by drowning, poisoning, fire, guns, and falls. In addition to the nearly 10,000 fatalities, another 175,000 children were hospitalized due to injuries.

Dr. C. Everett Koop, who served as U.S. Surgeon General under President Reagan, once said: "If a disease were killing our children in the proportions that injuries are, people would be outraged and demand that this killer be stopped."

Despite trauma being the overwhelming cause of childhood death, the Federal Government spends only about 1 cent on pediatric trauma research for every dollar spent to study pediatric cancer.

The Childress Institute has been working to pick up where Federal dollars have dropped off. The institute uses its resources for research, education, and awareness about pediatric trauma and to improve the treatment for critically injured children in the U.S.

Mr. Speaker, Richard Childress is a lifelong resident of the Winston-Salem area, and is a NASCAR pioneer. Richard and his wife, Judy, are civic and philanthropic leaders in the community. Through their determination to fight the number one cause of pediatric death, children worldwide are benefiting from the generosity that those of us in North Carolina have long witnessed.

□ 1845

The remarkable people of the Childress Institute for Pediatric Trauma work tirelessly to discover and share the best ways to prevent injuries and treat severely injured children, with the ultimate goal of ensuring that all "injured kids get the best care when they need it the most."

Today, I thank Richard and Judy Childress for their foresight and generosity, and I thank the Wake Forest Baptist Medical Center in Winston-Salem for its expertise and dedication to this mission.

Finally, I want to recognize the dedicated men and women of the Childress