

minute, but this is a bill to reauthorize the capital repair and maintenance programs at the Kennedy Center.

In 2012, I helped introduce and Congress passed the last reauthorization for the Kennedy Center, and I want to thank again the current leader of the Transportation Committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), for his leadership on this issue and for also moving this legislation forward, and as I said, Mr. BARLETTA and Mr. CARSON from Indiana have also taken the lead on this measure.

The building, of course, is a national monument. It is our national cultural center. In fact, it is owned and maintained by the Federal Government, and it is a memorial to the late John F. Kennedy.

Now, I want to cite in the RECORD, to let folks know this because most people don't know this, that the idea that came forth for the Kennedy Center was not so much by President Kennedy, but it was the foresight and vision of President Eisenhower. President Eisenhower actually proposed a national cultural center when he was President.

When they renovated the Eisenhower Theater several years ago, some of the Eisenhower family was there, and they actually showed clips of President Eisenhower proposing a national cultural center, so it was his idea and his vision.

It was named for our slain and great President Kennedy, but the vision for the national cultural center again came from Dwight David Eisenhower, our President. I actually saw an old film of him describing his vision for what we have.

The other thing I wanted to say is, since we built the Kennedy Center—and this is a reauthorization. Some several years ago, I had the opportunity to introduce legislation for the first real expansion, which I understand is now underway, the plans and some of the preliminary design.

When they built the Kennedy Center, it was a performing arts center, but it never had an educational component. It never had the space that they need. So of all the legislation I have participated in, I couldn't be more proud than helping to author the first expansion since we constructed that building.

This measure, however, is a reauthorization for some of their operations and their capital repairs which is part of our responsibility as the Federal Government, so capital programs are critical.

I might say that in the expansion there is no Federal public money, that it is all money that is raised privately. It is also important that we pass this legislation because it provides effective and efficient building operations for the next 5 years.

The amounts authorized in the legislation will help address building inefficiencies that we currently have. It will assure that the building can continue to operate cost-effectively and will also reduce costs for the taxpayers, so those

are some of the points that I would like to make.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. CARSON of Indiana asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank my very esteemed colleague from Florida, Chairman MICA.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be an original cosponsor of H.R. 5448, which reauthorizes the Kennedy Center through fiscal year 2019 for operations, repairs, and capital projects. The authorization levels in this bill are derived from the Kennedy Center's 2014 comprehensive building plan and are supported by the Kennedy Center.

The Kennedy Center is, first and foremost, a Presidential memorial. We have a responsibility to fund its maintenance, consistent with the dignity of a memorial to the 35th President of the United States of America.

Now, I strongly believe, Mr. Speaker, that allocating funding for proactive maintenance and repairs is in the best interest of our taxpayers. The Kennedy Center is one of the Nation's busiest arts facilities. It presents more than 2,000 performances annually and hosts thousands of theatergoers, visitors, and tourists.

To Chairman MICA's point, the Kennedy Center also provides educational programs for teachers and students from prekindergarten through college across the U.S. This includes a variety of events and activities across the great Hoosier State of Indiana.

These programs are supported by performance fees and donations and include professional development for arts, teachers, specially-designed concerts, phenomenal training programs for talented young musicians, and other outreach projects.

The Kennedy Center is providing tremendous value to taxpayers through educational opportunities and performances, promoting their mission of being a national cultural center.

President Kennedy once said, "After the dust of centuries has passed over our cities, we will be remembered not for our victories or defeats in battle or in politics, but for our contributions to the human spirit."

In conclusion, I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting the John F. Kennedy Reauthorization Act of 2014, so we can continue this phenomenal work.

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

Mr. MICA. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I ask for my colleagues to join us in the approval of a bipartisan piece of legislation that again authorizes the capital repair costs and maintenance for the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5448.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## STELA REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2014

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5728) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 and title 17, United States Code, to extend expiring provisions relating to the retransmission of signals of television broadcast stations, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5728

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

### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "STELA Reauthorization Act of 2014".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. No additional appropriations authorized.

### TITLE I—COMMUNICATIONS PROVISIONS

Sec. 101. Extension of authority.

Sec. 102. Modification of television markets to further consumer access to relevant television programming.

Sec. 103. Consumer protections in retransmission consent.

Sec. 104. Delayed application of JSA attribution rule.

Sec. 105. Deletion or repositioning of stations during certain periods.

Sec. 106. Repeal of integration ban.

Sec. 107. Report on communications implications of statutory licensing modifications.

Sec. 108. Local network channel broadcast reports.

Sec. 109. Report on designated market areas.

Sec. 110. Update to cable rates report.

Sec. 111. Administrative reforms to effective competition petitions.

Sec. 112. Definitions.

### TITLE II—COPYRIGHT PROVISIONS

Sec. 201. Reauthorization.

Sec. 202. Termination of license.

Sec. 203. Local service area of a primary transmitter.

Sec. 204. Market determinations.

### TITLE III—SEVERABILITY

Sec. 301. Severability.

### SEC. 2. NO ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED.

No additional funds are authorized to carry out this Act, or the amendments made by this Act. This Act, and the amendments made by this Act, shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized or appropriated.

### TITLE I—COMMUNICATIONS PROVISIONS

#### SEC. 101. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY.

Section 325(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 325(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(C), by striking "December 31, 2014" and inserting "December 31, 2019"; and

(2) in paragraph (3)(C), by striking “January 1, 2015” each place it appears and inserting “January 1, 2020”.

**SEC. 102. MODIFICATION OF TELEVISION MARKETS TO FURTHER CONSUMER ACCESS TO RELEVANT TELEVISION PROGRAMMING.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 338 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 338) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(1) MARKET DETERMINATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Following a written request, the Commission may, with respect to a particular commercial television broadcast station, include additional communities within its local market or exclude communities from such station’s local market to better effectuate the purposes of this section.

“(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—In considering requests filed under paragraph (1), the Commission—

“(A) may determine that particular communities are part of more than one local market; and

“(B) shall afford particular attention to the value of localism by taking into account such factors as—

“(i) whether the station, or other stations located in the same area—

“(I) have been historically carried on the cable system or systems within such community; or

“(II) have been historically carried on the satellite carrier or carriers serving such community;

“(ii) whether the television station provides coverage or other local service to such community;

“(iii) whether modifying the local market of the television station would promote consumers’ access to television broadcast station signals that originate in their State of residence;

“(iv) whether any other television station that is eligible to be carried by a satellite carrier in such community in fulfillment of the requirements of this section provides news coverage of issues of concern to such community or provides carriage or coverage of sporting and other events of interest to the community; and

“(v) evidence of viewing patterns in households that subscribe and do not subscribe to the services offered by multichannel video programming distributors within the areas served by such multichannel video programming distributors in such community.

“(3) CARRIAGE OF SIGNALS.—

“(A) CARRIAGE OBLIGATION.—A market determination under this subsection shall not create additional carriage obligations for a satellite carrier if it is not technically and economically feasible for such carrier to accomplish such carriage by means of its satellites in operation at the time of the determination.

“(B) DELETION OF SIGNALS.—A satellite carrier shall not delete from carriage the signal of a commercial television broadcast station during the pendency of any proceeding under this subsection.

“(4) DETERMINATIONS.—Not later than 120 days after the date that a written request is filed under paragraph (1), the Commission shall grant or deny the request.

“(5) NO EFFECT ON ELIGIBILITY TO RECEIVE DISTANT SIGNALS.—No modification of a commercial television broadcast station’s local market pursuant to this subsection shall have any effect on the eligibility of households in the community affected by such modification to receive distant signals pursuant to section 339, notwithstanding subsection (h)(1) of this section.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 614(h)(1)(C) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 534(h)(1)(C)) is amended—

(1) in clause (ii)—

(A) in subclause (I), by striking “community” and inserting “community or on the satellite carrier or carriers serving such community”; and

(B) by redesignating subclauses (III) and (IV) as subclauses (IV) and (V), respectively;

(C) by inserting after subclause (II) the following:

“(III) whether modifying the market of the television station would promote consumers’ access to television broadcast station signals that originate in their State of residence;”; and

(D) by amending subclause (V), as redesignated, to read as follows:

“(V) evidence of viewing patterns in households that subscribe and do not subscribe to the services offered by multichannel video programming distributors within the areas served by such multichannel video programming distributors in such community.”; and

(2) by moving the margin of clause (iv) 2 ems to the left.

(c) MARKET MODIFICATION PROCESS.—The Commission shall make information available to consumers on its website that explains the market modification process, including—

(1) who may petition to include additional communities within, or exclude communities from, a—

(A) local market (as defined in section 122(j) of title 17, United States Code); or

(B) television market (as determined under section 614(h)(1)(C) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 534(h)(1)(C))); and

(2) the factors that the Commission takes into account when responding to a petition described in paragraph (1).

(d) IMPLEMENTATION.—

(1) DEADLINE FOR REGULATIONS.—Not later than 9 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall promulgate regulations to implement this section and the amendments made by this section.

(2) MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION.—As part of the rulemaking required by paragraph (1), the Commission shall ensure that procedures for the filing and consideration of a written request under sections 338(1) and 614(h)(1)(C) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 338(1); 534(h)(1)(C)) fully effectuate the purposes of the amendments made by this section, and update what it considers to be a community for purposes of a modification of a market under section 338(1) or 614(h)(1)(C) of the Communications Act of 1934.

**SEC. 103. CONSUMER PROTECTIONS IN RETRANSMISSION CONSENT.**

(a) JOINT RETRANSMISSION CONSENT NEGOTIATIONS.—Section 325(b)(3)(C) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 325(b)(3)(C)) is amended—

(1) in clause (ii), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in clause (iii), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(iv) prohibit a television broadcast station from coordinating negotiations or negotiating on a joint basis with another television broadcast station in the same local market (as defined in section 122(j) of title 17, United States Code) to grant retransmission consent under this section to a multichannel video programming distributor, unless such stations are directly or indirectly under common de jure control permitted under the regulations of the Commission; and”.

(b) PROTECTIONS FOR SIGNIFICANTLY VIEWED AND OTHER TELEVISION SIGNALS.—Section 325(b)(3)(C) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 325(b)(3)(C)) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(v) prohibit a television broadcast station from limiting the ability of a multichannel video programming distributor to carry into the local market (as defined in section 122(j) of title 17, United States Code) of such station a television signal that has been deemed significantly viewed, within the meaning of section 76.54 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation, or any other television broadcast signal such distributor is authorized to carry under section 338, 339, 340, or 614 of this Act, unless such stations are directly or indirectly under common de jure control permitted by the Commission.”.

(c) GOOD FAITH.—Not later than 9 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall commence a rulemaking to review its totality of the circumstances test for good faith negotiations under clauses (ii) and (iii) of section 325(b)(3)(C) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 325(b)(3)(C)).

(d) MARGIN CORRECTIONS.—Section 325(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 325(b)) is further amended—

(1) in paragraph (3)(C), by moving the margin of clause (iii) 4 ems to the left; and

(2) by moving the margin of paragraph (7) 2 ems to the left.

(e) DEADLINE FOR REGULATIONS.—Not later than 9 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall promulgate regulations to implement the amendments made by this section.

**SEC. 104. DELAYED APPLICATION OF JSA ATTRIBUTION RULE.**

A party to a joint sales agreement (as defined in Note 2(k) to section 73.3555 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations) that is in effect on the effective date of the amendment to Note 2(k)(2) to such section made by the Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and Report and Order adopted by the Commission on March 31, 2014 (FCC 14-28), shall not be considered to be in violation of the ownership limitations of such section by reason of the application of the rule in such Note 2(k)(2) (as so amended) to such agreement before the date that is 6 months after the end of the period specified by the Commission in such Report and Order for such a party to come into compliance with such ownership limitations.

**SEC. 105. DELETION OR REPOSITIONING OF STATIONS DURING CERTAIN PERIODS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 614(b)(9) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 534(b)(9)) is amended by striking the second sentence.

(b) REVISION OF RULES.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall revise section 76.1601 of its rules (47 C.F.R. 76.1601) and any note to such section by removing the prohibition against deletion or repositioning of a local commercial television station during a period in which major television ratings services measure the size of audiences of local television stations.

**SEC. 106. REPEAL OF INTEGRATION BAN.**

(a) TERMINATION OF EFFECTIVENESS.—The second sentence of section 76.1204(a)(1) of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, terminates effective on the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) REMOVAL FROM RULES.—Not later than 545 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall complete all actions necessary to remove the sentence described in subsection (a) from its rules.

(c) PRESERVATION OF WAIVERS.—Any waiver of section 76.1204(a)(1) of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, in effect as of the date of the enactment of this Act or granted after such date shall be extended through December 31, 2015.

## (d) WORKING GROUP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chairman of the Commission shall establish a working group of technical experts representing a wide range of stakeholders, to identify, report, and recommend performance objectives, technical capabilities, and technical standards of a not unduly burdensome, uniform, and technology- and platform-neutral software-based downloadable security system designed to promote the competitive availability of navigation devices in furtherance of section 629 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 549).

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 9 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the working group shall file a report with the Commission on its work under paragraph (1).

(3) COMMISSION ASSISTANCE.—The Chairman of the Commission may appoint a member of the Commission's staff—

(A) to moderate and direct the work of the working group under this subsection; and

(B) to provide technical assistance to members of the working group, as appropriate.

(4) INITIAL MEETING.—The initial meeting of the working group shall take place not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

**SEC. 107. REPORT ON COMMUNICATIONS IMPLICATIONS OF STATUTORY LICENSING MODIFICATIONS.**

(a) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study that analyzes and evaluates the changes to the carriage requirements currently imposed on multichannel video programming distributors under the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 151 et seq.) and the regulations promulgated by the Commission that would be required or beneficial to consumers, and such other matters as the Comptroller General considers appropriate, if Congress implemented a phase-out of the current statutory licensing requirements set forth under sections 111, 119, and 122 of title 17, United States Code. Among other things, the study shall consider the impact such a phase-out and related changes to carriage requirements would have on consumer prices and access to programming.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the results of the study conducted under subsection (a), including any recommendations for legislative or administrative actions. Such report shall also include a discussion of any differences between such results and the results of the study conducted under section 303 of the Satellite Television Extension and Localism Act of 2010 (124 Stat. 1255).

**SEC. 108. LOCAL NETWORK CHANNEL BROADCAST REPORTS.**

## (a) REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On the 270th day after the date of the enactment of this Act, and on each succeeding anniversary of such 270th day, each satellite carrier shall submit an annual report to the Commission setting forth—

(A) each local market in which it—

(i) retransmits signals of 1 or more television broadcast stations with a community of license in that market;

(ii) has commenced providing such signals in the preceding 1-year period; and

(iii) has ceased to provide such signals in the preceding 1-year period; and

(B) detailed information regarding the use and potential use of satellite capacity for the retransmission of local signals in each local market.

(2) TERMINATION.—The requirement under paragraph (1) shall cease after each satellite

carrier has submitted 5 reports under such paragraph.

## (b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the terms “local market” and “satellite carrier” have the meaning given such terms in section 339(d) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 339(d)); and

(2) the term “television broadcast station” has the meaning given such term in section 325(b)(7) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 325(b)(7)).

**SEC. 109. REPORT ON DESIGNATED MARKET AREAS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that contains—

(1) an analysis of—

(A) the extent to which consumers in each local market have access to broadcast programming from television broadcast stations located outside their local market, including through carriage by cable operators and satellite carriers of signals that are significantly viewed (within the meaning of section 340 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 340)); and

(B) whether there are technologically and economically feasible alternatives to the use of designated market areas to define markets that would provide consumers with more programming options and the potential impact such alternatives could have on localism and on broadcast television locally, regionally, and nationally; and

(2) recommendations on how to foster increased localism in counties served by out-of-State designated market areas.

(b) CONSIDERATIONS FOR FOSTERING INCREASED LOCALISM.—In making recommendations under subsection (a)(2), the Commission shall consider—

(1) the impact that designated market areas that cross State lines have on access to local programming;

(2) the impact that designated market areas have on local programming in rural areas; and

(3) the state of local programming in States served exclusively by out-of-State designated market areas.

**SEC. 110. UPDATE TO CABLE RATES REPORT.**

Section 623(k) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 543(k)) is amended to read as follows:

## “(k) REPORTS ON AVERAGE PRICES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall annually publish statistical reports on the average rates for basic cable service and other cable programming, and for converter boxes, remote control units, and other equipment of cable systems that the Commission has found are subject to effective competition under subsection (a)(2) compared with cable systems that the Commission has found are not subject to such effective competition.

## “(2) INCLUSION IN ANNUAL REPORT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall include in its report under paragraph (1) the aggregate average total amount paid by cable systems in compensation under section 325.

“(B) FORM.—The Commission shall publish information under this paragraph in a manner substantially similar to the way other comparable information is published in such report.”

**SEC. 111. ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS TO EFFECTIVE COMPETITION PETITIONS.**

Section 623 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 543) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(o) STREAMLINED PETITION PROCESS FOR SMALL CABLE OPERATORS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this sub-

section, the Commission shall complete a rulemaking to establish a streamlined process for filing of an effective competition petition pursuant to this section for small cable operators, particularly those who serve primarily rural areas.

“(2) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to have any effect on the duty of a small cable operator to prove the existence of effective competition under this section.

“(3) DEFINITION OF SMALL CABLE OPERATOR.—In this subsection, the term ‘small cable operator’ has the meaning given the term in subsection (m)(2).”

**SEC. 112. DEFINITIONS.**

In this title:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate.

(2) COMMISSION.—The term “Commission” means the Federal Communications Commission.

**TITLE II—COPYRIGHT PROVISIONS****SEC. 201. REAUTHORIZATION.**

Chapter 1 of title 17, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 111(d)(3)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “clause” and inserting “paragraph”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking “clause” and inserting “paragraph”; and

(2) in section 119—

(A) in subsection (c)(1)(E), by striking “2014” and inserting “2019”; and

(B) in subsection (e), by striking “2014” and inserting “2019”.

**SEC. 202. TERMINATION OF LICENSE.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 119 of title 17, United States Code, as amended in section 201, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) TERMINATION OF LICENSE.—This section shall cease to be effective on December 31, 2019.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 107(a) of the Satellite Television Extension and Localism Act of 2010 (17 U.S.C. 119 note) is repealed.

**SEC. 203. LOCAL SERVICE AREA OF A PRIMARY TRANSMITTER.**

Section 111(f)(4) of title 17, United States Code, is amended, in the second sentence—

(1) by inserting “as defined by the rules and regulations of the Federal Communications Commission,” after “television station,”;

(2) by striking “comprises the area within 35 miles of the transmitter site, except that” and inserting “comprises the designated market area, as defined in section 122(j)(2)(C), that encompasses the community of license of such station and any community that is located outside such designated market area that is either wholly or partially within 35 miles of the transmitter site or,”; and

(3) by striking “the number of miles shall be 20 miles” and inserting “wholly or partially within 20 miles of such transmitter site”.

**SEC. 204. MARKET DETERMINATIONS.**

Section 122(j)(2) of title 17, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by moving the margins of subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D) 2 ems to the left; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(E) MARKET DETERMINATIONS.—The local market of a commercial television broadcast station may be modified by the Federal Communications Commission in accordance with

section 338(l) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 338).”.

### TITLE III—SEVERABILITY

#### SEC. 301. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act, an amendment made by this Act, or the application of such provision or amendment to any person or circumstance is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act, the amendments made by this Act, and the application of such provision or amendment to any person or circumstance shall not be affected thereby.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to offer yet another outstanding example of bipartisanship and thoughtful policymaking from the Energy and Commerce Committee.

The STELA Reauthorization Act is an important piece of legislation that ensures that millions of satellite TV subscribers continue to receive broadcast TV programming from their chosen satellite provider.

We have reached across party lines and across the two houses of Congress to craft a compromise for this must-pass legislation that will improve the video marketplace for TV viewers across the country.

In addition to reauthorizing the distant signals offered by satellite providers, we were able to include targeted reforms that in fact will enhance the video marketplace and allow consumers to access the programming that they want when they want it.

These reforms are prime examples of the kinds of deregulatory changes that we are looking at as we work to replace the 80-year-old Communications Act. They are going to spur investment in communications networks, promote competition, and, yes, create needed American jobs.

For example, the bill eliminates the costly CableCARD integration ban that has increased the cost of cable-leased set-top boxes and makes them less energy efficient. Ultimately, this is a double whammy for consumers because, after being forced to pay for an unnecessary and antiquated technology, consumers then have to pay a penalty in the form of higher electric bills.

Although we eliminated the whole mandate in our original bill that we

passed through our committee, we worked with our Senate colleagues and agreed to sunset the provision in 1 year.

This will provide time for the FCC to hold a working group on successor solutions to CableCARD without unduly delaying the benefits to consumers who choose to lease equipment from their cable provider.

The bill also evens the playing field for all video providers. It seeks regulatory parity for cable and satellite providers when it comes to protecting broadcast signals during Nielsen sweeps. It also provides satellite operators and broadcasters with the opportunity to modify local markets, like cable operators already have the ability to do.

□ 1245

We hope that in our updated Communications Act that we can find additional ways to eliminate regulatory differences that no longer serve a meaningful, technical purpose or that distort business and consumer incentives.

The bill provides other positive, bipartisan reforms, and it is our intent that as we update the Communications Act in the coming Congress that it continue along that very same path. That being said, the matter before us is the reauthorization of these provisions for the millions of satellite viewer subscribers that depend on them. The clock is ticking, and the bill will ensure when folks flip on their TVs, yes, their favorite show will be available when they want to watch it.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to vote for the bill as this Congress is quickly drawing to a close.

I particularly want to thank Subcommittee on Communications and Technology Chair GREG WALDEN, Ranking Members HENRY WAXMAN and ANNA ESHOO, and Judiciary Chairman BOB GOODLATTE, as well as our respective staffs for their bipartisan and hard work on this very important legislation. I also want to thank our Senate colleagues JAY ROCKEFELLER and JOHN THUNE for their willingness to work with us to find common ground.

I am proud of our committee's record of bipartisan results. As we work toward the Communications Act update next year to modernize our Nation's communication laws for the innovation era, continued cooperation will be critical to that success. Without this bill, without this reauthorization being moved forward, satellite viewers—millions of Americans—will have those sets turned off. It is important that we reauthorize this bill, and I am pleased to do so in a very bipartisan way.

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5728, the Satellite Television Extension and Localism Act Reauthorization.

This is the continuation of our bipartisan efforts this year to ensure that 1.5 million satellite subscribers don't lose access to broadcast programming when the current satellite television law expires at the end of this year and to make some targeted reforms to the video marketplace. The bill before us today represents a compromise with our colleagues from the Senate, and I look forward to working with them to quickly see it passed into law.

In July, the House passed H.R. 4572, to reauthorize the expiring communications and copyright law that allows households across America, but especially those in rural areas, access to broadcast content. In addition, the Energy and Commerce Committee on which I serve was able to come to agreement on several key reforms to our video laws to benefit the TV-watching public.

H.R. 5728 maintains these bipartisan provisions from the bill we adopted in July, in particular addressing the abuses in the retransmission consent process. The bill prevents two non-commonly owned broadcasters from colluding to jointly negotiate for retransmission consent.

The Energy and Commerce Committee heard extensive testimony about how this practice drives up prices for consumers and potentially threatens access to local broadcast content. I also want to emphasize that this language does not permit broadcast stations that are deemed “commonly owned” as a result of the joint sales agreement to negotiate jointly for retransmission consent.

Our colleagues on the Senate Commerce Committee proposed additional pro-consumer reforms, and I am pleased that we were able to include those in H.R. 5728. Mr. Speaker, these provisions include an FCC rulemaking to assess the standard for determining whether parties are negotiating in good faith for retransmission consent, a prohibition on broadcasters preventing significantly viewed signals from being carried in local markets, and greater transparency for consumers by including retransmission consent payments in the FCC's report on cable rates.

H.R. 5728 also makes further changes to the provisions that were heavily debated in the House during consideration of H.R. 4572. The bill now extends by 6 months the deadline for broadcasters to unwind certain joint sales agreements, a rule which the FCC tightened earlier this year to address concerns that broadcaster coordination in local markets were undermining localism, competition, and diversity.

Finally, H.R. 5728 reflects further compromise on the FCC's cable set-top box rules. The FCC's integration ban—the rule written to promote competition in the cable set-top box market—will sunset in 1 year. This well-intentioned rule has not resulted in the kind of competition Congress envisioned and has actually caused significant energy inefficiencies in cable set-top boxes.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that we are including an idea from our Senate colleagues to create a working group that is charged with identifying a successor solution. I support further efforts to promote competition in the set-top box market and look forward to engaging with the working group and the FCC on this issue.

I want to thank Chairman UPTON and Chairman WALDEN, and on the Senate side, Chairman ROCKEFELLER and Ranking Member THUNE, also our ranking members on our side of the aisle, Ranking Members WAXMAN and ESHOO, and other Democrats on our committee.

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

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), the distinguished chairman of the Telecommunications Subcommittee.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, last July the House of Representatives passed H.R. 4572, the STELA Reauthorization Act, by unanimous vote. Today, after extensive consultation with our colleagues in the Senate, we are offering a second version of STELA's reauthorization, which will extend the copyright and retransmission consent provisions for distant signals retransmitted by commercial satellite providers for 5 years. Now, if we don't act to extend these provisions by the end of this Congress, there will be 1.5 million subscribers to satellite television, including many in my home State of Oregon, that just won't have access to broadcast network programming come New Year's Day.

This bill represents the best of how Congress can work together and get things done. Today's version of STELAR is a compromise bill that incorporates the previously passed provisions—these were passed unanimously by the House earlier this year—with the provisions that passed by voice vote out of the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation. Now, by coming together to produce legislation with strong, bipartisan, bicameral support, we have demonstrated our clear commitment to the continued availability of broadcast programming to millions of subscribers and to some targeted and, in some cases, much-needed reforms to our communications laws.

Specifically, Mr. Speaker, this bill sets a date for the sunset of the FCC's integration ban on cable-leased set-top boxes. That clears the way for innovation and new investment by lifting an unnecessary regulatory burden that has cost the cable industry and its consumers \$1 billion. One billion dollars, Mr. Speaker, since 2007 it has cost.

I especially want to thank Vice Chairman BOB LATTA, who is right here, and my Democratic colleague from Texas, GENE GREEN, whom you have just heard from, for their thoughtful, bipartisan work on lifting the integration ban.

Now, the bill offers a glide path for those companies that currently rely on CableCARD and urges the consumer electronics manufacturers and MVPDs to work together to find a next-generation solution for a competitive set-top box market.

Our bill also opens up the ability for satellite operators and broadcasters to modify local markets so that consumers can receive programming that is relevant to their communities. Broadcasters have long had the ability to reach such agreements with cable systems, and this bill creates parity, allowing broadcasters to ensure their programming is reaching the right communities via satellite, regardless of DMA boundaries. Our bill also provides parity by removing a government restriction on cable's ability to drop broadcast signals during the Nielsen sweeps. Additionally, the bill ensures that consumers will be able to access locally relevant broadcasts from outside their local markets without interference from local broadcasters.

Mr. Speaker, we have also sought to stabilize the retransmission consent regime. This bill prohibits broadcast stations in single markets from negotiating jointly with cable and satellite operators. The bill also seeks to allow policymakers to gather more information on retransmission consent by requiring cable operators to report annually on their payments for broadcast programming. This bill also asks the FCC to reexamine the meaning of "good faith" in retransmission consent negotiations, but, importantly, it does not predetermine any outcomes for that rulemaking.

The STELA Reauthorization Act is yet another example of true bipartisanship with support from all sectors of the communications industry. This type of collaboration has long been the hallmark of our committee, and I am pleased to see the legislative result before us today. As this Congress is drawing to a close quickly, I urge my colleagues to join me in getting this important legislation onto the President's desk and signed into law before the authorization ends at the end of the year.

Now, it takes many hands to make light work, and this bill is no different. In particular, Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the staff from the House Commerce Committee's staff, David Redl, Ray Baum, Grace Koh, Shawn Chang, Margaret McCarthy, and David Grossman; as well as Senate Commerce staff Ellen Doneski, John Branscome, Shawn Bone, David Quinalty, and Hap Rigby. They spent many hours working to find common ground on this bill, Mr. Speaker, and their effort has paid off for consumers.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the Republican whip and a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman UPTON for yielding and for his leadership, as well as Chairman WALDEN of the subcommittee and the ranking members, for bringing a good bipartisan bill to the floor that addresses some real problems and starts to lay some groundwork for important future discussions about the video marketplace.

Let me first say, Mr. Speaker, that the STELA Reauthorization Act will give certainty and ensure that 1.5 million satellite consumers across the country don't have to fear losing their signal at the end of this year, which will happen without passage of this legislation. So it is very important that immediately we get this resolved so that we don't create that uncertainty across the country.

Also, Mr. Speaker, why this bill is important is it finally starts to implement some important and much-needed reforms to our video marketplace laws. I have been saying this a long time: If you look at the laws that we have on the books, we have a 21st century marketplace, we have a dynamic industry that has evolved and grown, and the technology has advanced in a dramatic way over the last few decades, but, unfortunately, the laws have not changed to reflect the current marketplace. We have started that conversation with a few of the provisions in this bill, and I was happy to work with the chairman, the ranking member, and others on some of those provisions; and we also talked about the need to have a deeper conversation about a Communications Act update next year in the new Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with my colleagues on that as well. But in the meantime, it is important that we pass this bill and that we urge the Senate to move quickly as well to create that certainty for those customers all across the country that are counting on us to get this done.

Again, I congratulate the chairman and ranking member for working in a bipartisan way to bring this bill to the House floor and pass it along.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, at this point I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA), the vice chair of the subcommittee.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), the chairman of the full committee, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5728, the STELA Reauthorization Act of 2014. I am pleased to see the

bipartisan and bicameral effort that took place to bring forth this must-pass legislation.

Through the leadership of Chairman UPTON and Chairman WALDEN and with the bipartisan support of Ranking Member WAXMAN and Subcommittee Ranking Member ESHOO, this legislation underscores a commitment to ensuring that our communication laws maximize the potential for investment, innovation, and consumer choice.

Mr. Speaker, I am especially pleased this bill incorporates a bipartisan and pro-consumer provision to eliminate the current set-top box integration ban, similar to the one that I, along with Congressman GENE GREEN, sponsored in the House. Repealing this outdated technological mandate will foster greater investment and innovation in the set-top box market. It is clear that the integration ban is simply unnecessary and does not reflect the technological advancements or consumer demands of today, which have been agreed upon and supported on a bipartisan level, even by the Progressive Policy Institute.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" and support this bipartisan legislation. Again, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I continue to reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

□ 1300

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon the House will consider joint Judiciary and Energy and Commerce Committee legislation, H.R. 5728, the STELA Reauthorization Act of 2014, to ensure that all of our constituents continue to have access to network channels on America's two satellite carriers.

Title II of the legislation extends the expiring section 119 copyright license for another 5 years, as this committee has done on previous occasions, most recently in 2010. This license ensures that when our constituents do not have access to a full complement of local network television stations, they can have access through satellite television carriers to distant network television stations. This helps ensure that consumers in rural areas, like mine in Pennsylvania's 10th Congressional District, have the same access to news and entertainment options that consumers in urban areas enjoy.

Without enactment of this legislation, many of our constituents would potentially lose access to certain networks altogether on December 31, when the current license expires.

I would like to point out that although numerous stakeholders interested in video issues have contacted the committee on a variety of issues, they all agree that this license should not expire at the end of this year.

Other issues of interest in this area will be the subject of further discussion as my committee continues its ongoing review of our Nation's copyright laws.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bipartisan, pro-consumer legislation.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the ranking member on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

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

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am a strong supporter of science-based policies. Throughout my career, I have always welcomed expert scientific advice and relied upon facts and scientific evidence to legislate. But the bill we are considering today is not a sound science bill; it is actually an anti-science bill. It would take away the ability of decision-makers to rely on published, peer-reviewed studies to protect our health and our planet.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I am opposed to the next bill that we will consider.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Texas continue to yield time on this legislation, H.R. 5728?

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I continue to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want Members to know I am going to put a statement in the RECORD supporting this legislation and urging all of our colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5728, the Satellite Television Extension and Localism Act Reauthorization. The House passed H.R. 4572 in July, a bill that extends the expiring satellite television law and makes targeted reforms to the video marketplace. Since that time, we have engaged in bicameral, bipartisan negotiations that produced the compromise bill before us today.

First and foremost, H.R. 5728 ensures that 1.5 million satellite subscribers across the country will not lose access to broadcast content when current law expires at the end of the year.

H.R. 5728 maintains the key provisions designed to address abuses in the video marketplace that received bipartisan support in the Energy and Commerce Committee. In particular, it prohibits the collusive practice of joint retransmission consent negotiations by two or more broadcasters in the same market.

I want to note that the language is carefully crafted to ensure it does not become a loophole for broadcasters who are deemed "commonly owned" under the Joint Sales Agreement attribution rules to continue to jointly negotiate retransmission consent deals with distributors.

Further, we adopt additional reforms proposed by our colleagues in the Senate Commerce Committee.

For example, the FCC must re-examine its standard for determining whether parties are

negotiating in "good faith" for retransmission consent and provide greater transparency for consumers by including retransmission consent payments in the agency's report on cable rates.

Finally, H.R. 5728 reflects further compromise on two provisions that were the subject of extensive negotiations here in the House earlier this year.

The bill alters a provision we included to address concerns about implementation of new FCC limits on broadcaster coordination through Joint Sales Agreements. We now provide a simple six month extension for broadcasters required to unwind those agreements under the new FCC rule.

Second, the bill delays by one year the sunset of the FCC's "integration ban," which is a rule intended to stimulate competition in the cable set top box market.

We also added another good idea from the Senate bill by creating a working group tasked with identifying a successor solution. The well-intentioned integration ban has had the perverse effect of hindering energy efficiency in set top boxes.

Removing the integration ban from the FCC's rule books does not eliminate the separable security requirement that ensures competitive access to cable companies' own decryption technology for set top boxes. But it does allow for innovation in the delivery of cable TV in ways that will increase energy efficiency.

I support further efforts to promote competition in this area and know that my colleagues will be actively engaged with the working group next year.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting H.R. 5728.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5728, the STELA Reauthorization Act of 2014.

Nearly four months ago, the House passed legislation to reauthorize the Satellite Television Extension and Localism Act of 2010 (STELA). The language before the House today reflects a compromise reached with the leadership of the Senate Commerce Committee and paves the way for an extension of STELA prior to the expiration of the statute on December 31, 2014.

Like the bill passed by voice vote in July, H.R. 5728 reauthorizes STELA for a period of five years, ensuring that approximately 1.5 million satellite subscribers can continue accessing broadcast television signals. Reflecting my belief that our video laws are outdated and in some cases are even being abused, H.R. 5728 requires the FCC to re-examine its 'good faith' rules to ensure retransmission consent negotiations are conducted fairly and in a timely manner.

To better understand how retransmission consent fees impact a consumer's monthly bill, H.R. 5728 requires the FCC to include aggregate data as part of its annual report on cable rates. This provision will bring about much needed transparency because retransmission consent fees are estimated to rise from \$4.3 billion this year to an estimated whopping \$5.1 billion in 2015.



H.R. 5728 also includes a provision I strongly supported during committee debate to ensure broadcasters cannot team up against pay-TV providers for leverage during retransmission consent negotiations. This is an important step toward rebalancing the playing field and ultimately protecting consumers from unacceptable blackouts and increased rates.

Finally, H.R. 5728 improves on language included in the bill adopted in July by delaying repeal of the cable set-top box 'integration ban' by one year and establishing a stakeholder working group tasked with developing a successor solution. Importantly, this provision does not negate a cable operator's obligation to promote the competitive availability of set-top boxes under Section 629 of the Communications Act. While I continue to believe repeal of the ban should be conditioned on an industry-wide adoption of a successor to the CableCARD, this is a compromise I support. With an eye to the future, we can fulfill a goal I set out to achieve nearly 20 years ago and that is to give consumers an alternative to having to rent a set-top box from their local cable company every month.

For all these reasons, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 5728.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5728.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### SECRET SCIENCE REFORM ACT OF 2014

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 4012.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 756 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. 4012.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1310

##### 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. 4012) to prohibit the Environmental Protection Agency from proposing, finalizing, or disseminating regulations or assessments based upon science that is not transparent or reproducible, with Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding me this time.

H.R. 4012, the Secret Science Reform Act, is a short, commonsense bill. It requires the Environmental Protection Agency to base its regulations on public information. I thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT), the chairman of the Environment Subcommittee, for introducing this bill.

Costly environmental regulations should only be based upon data that is available to independent scientists and the public. However, the EPA does not adhere to this practice. In fact, nearly every major air-quality regulation from this administration has been justified by data that it has kept secret. This means the Agency's claims about the benefits of its rules cannot be verified by independent scientists.

This includes the recent plan to regulate our entire electric system. This proposal will kill thousands of jobs and increase electricity costs, all for no discernible effect on global temperatures.

This also includes upcoming ozone regulations, which even the administration admits will be the most expensive in history. Unachievable standards will result in economic hardship, stalled new road projects, and burdened local governments.

Unfortunately, EPA clearly sees transparency and accountability as a threat. Speaking before the National Academy of Sciences, EPA Administrator Gina McCarthy said that her agency needed to keep the science "from those not qualified to analyze it." But the public deserves better, and this administration promised more. In 2012, the President's science adviser testified:

Absolutely, the data on which regulatory decisions are based should be public.

The chair of EPA's own Science Advisory Board testified that EPA's advisers recommend "that literature and data used by EPA be peer reviewed and made available to the public."

Americans agree. A recent poll from the Institute for Energy Research found that 90 percent of Americans believe that studies and data used to make Federal Government decisions should in fact be made public.

Reforms to the EPA's regulatory process are consistent with the data access requirements of major scientific journals, the White House scientific integrity policy, and the recommendations of independent groups like the

Administrative Conference of the U.S. and the Bipartisan Policy Center. Deans of major universities, former EPA scientists, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and dozens of experts and organizations all support this bill.

A letter from more than 80 scientists and academics stated that:

Complying with H.R. 4012 can be accomplished without imposing unnecessary burdens, discouraging research, or raising confidentiality concerns.

The signatories include professors, two former chairs of EPA science committees, medical doctors, statisticians, deans of major universities, and environmental scientists.

The Secret Science Reform Act prohibits the disclosure of confidential or proprietary information protected by the law. Instead, it stops EPA's use of unverifiable science.

□ 1315

For those who are concerned about the regulations already on the books, the act is not retroactive. It applies only to new future regulations issued by the Agency.

The act requires the EPA to base its decisions on information to which all scientists will have access. This will allow the EPA to focus its limited resources on quality science that all researchers can examine. This will promote sound science and confidence in the EPA decisionmaking process.

This bill ensures the transparency and accountability that the American people want and deserve.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, this bill does not permit me to mince words. This bill is an insidious attack on EPA's ability to use the best science to protect public health, and its consideration on the House floor today is the culmination of one of the most anti-science and anti-health campaigns I have witnessed in my 22 years as a Member of Congress.

The genesis of this legislation is the Republicans' longstanding obsession with two seminal scientific studies conducted by Harvard University and the American Cancer Society.

These studies link air pollution with increased illnesses and death; moreover, those results were confirmed by multiple independent researchers and organizations including the National Research Council and the Health Effects Institute.

The Republican majority has harassed EPA for more than 2 years in an attempt to get access to the raw data used in those studies, presumably in an attempt to cast doubt on the conclusion that air pollution is bad for the health of Americans and to prevent EPA from trying to keep the air we breathe clean.

The EPA told my Republican colleagues that since the studies involved the personal health information of