

“Aspects of this plan present heightened risks of fraud, waste, and mismanagement that warrant particularly close oversight.”

So now it is time for Congress to act to protect national service, not fund a plan that promotes fraud, waste, and abuse. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor H.R. 1458, the Keep Community Service Local Act, which prohibits the closing of State offices.

ETO TESTING IN LAKE COUNTY

(Mr. SCHNEIDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, last month, I spoke on the floor about the urgent need for EPA ambient air testing at two manufacturing facilities in Lake County that use ethylene oxide, a known carcinogen.

As well, I and my colleagues in the Illinois delegation have written to the EPA urging them to undertake ambient air monitoring.

The neighbors living near these plants, as well as the local governments, need to know that the air they breathe is safe. Yet the EPA still refuses to conduct any ambient air monitoring, instead insisting on using dispersion models based on estimates of smokestack emissions.

Such dispersion monitoring is completely inadequate because it fails to account for what are known as fugitive emissions, Eto escaping into the environment from locations other than the smokestack.

Absent EPA leadership, the local municipalities and the Lake County Public Health Department have stepped up to pursue monitoring on their own.

Good for them, but it should not have come to this. They are only doing so because the EPA has failed to do its job.

Our communities deserve far better from the EPA. This is about our families and the public health. I urge the EPA to do its duty and to begin this vital testing immediately.

FAIRNESS FOR HIGH-SKILLED IMMIGRANTS ACT

(Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my support for H.R. 1044, the Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act, introduced by Congresswoman LOFGREN. This bipartisan legislation will help ease green card backlogs for those facing the longest wait times and help our businesses retain the high-skilled staff they need to be competitive.

Last month, I sat down with Sunayana Dumala, who shared her story with me.

It was only 2 years ago that our community was devastated when

Sunayana's husband, Srinivas, was murdered in a hate crime in Olathe, Kansas. My predecessor helped her obtain a temporary visa, but she still faces a potentially decades-long wait to gain citizenship. This is because, with him gone, her status was at risk.

These green card backlogs need to be resolved. Sunayana is not alone. Many people have applied for permanent residency and are stuck in long backlogs for green cards.

H.R. 1044 creates a fair and equitable first-come, first-served system, helping to even out green card lines and helping to prevent excessive backlogs for folks like Sunayana. It allows U.S. companies to focus on what they do best: hiring people with the right skills to create products, services, and jobs.

This is a piece of a larger, more comprehensive reform needed to fix our broken immigration system.

ADVOCATING FOR MEDICAID BILL

(Mr. RUIZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill to help working Americans access quality, affordable healthcare.

Last month, I introduced the bipartisan Medicaid Services Investment and Accountability Act, which has already unanimously passed the House and Senate. With the President's signature, this bill will help parents coordinate care for a sick child and protect seniors from going bankrupt to pay for their loved one's in-home care.

My bill will also address skyrocketing prescription drug costs by preventing pharmaceutical companies from cheating State Medicaid programs.

As an emergency physician, I know that timely access to care is critical to helping every family live a full, healthy, and productive life. We must put patients first.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the President to sign this important bill into law immediately.

IN HONOR OF DERRICK NELSON

(Mr. MALINOWSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MALINOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor a hero in my district who passed away this week.

Mr. Derrick Nelson was the principal of the high school in Westfield, New Jersey. He was known to students, to parents, and to teachers for his generosity and selflessness.

Mr. Nelson dedicated his life to serving his country and community. He spent 20 years in the U.S. Army Reserves, including a deployment in the Middle East.

He began his career in New Jersey education in 2002 and joined the West-

field school system in 2010, officially becoming principal in 2017. Students and teachers said he always had a smile on his face, and his energy was infectious.

It was this kindness of spirit that led Mr. Nelson to donate his bone marrow to a 14-year-old boy in France. He did not know the boy, he just wanted to give something of himself to save a child's life.

He suffered a complication from the procedure. He never woke up.

Mr. Speaker, with the passing of Derrick Nelson, we have lost a leader in our community and a great and good man. I extend my deepest condolences to his family, and I hope they find comfort in knowing that the extraordinary legacy he leaves behind will continue to inspire and guide the people who had the privilege to know him.

SAVE THE INTERNET ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STANTON). Pursuant to House Resolution 294 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1644.

Will the gentleman from California (Mr. CISNEROS) kindly take the chair.

□ 0915

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 further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1644) to restore the open internet order of the Federal Communications Commission, with Mr. CISNEROS (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, April 9, 2019, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 116-37 offered by the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. WEXTON) had been postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MS. DAVIDS OF KANSAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part A of House Report 116-37.

Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 4. GAO REPORT ON BROADBAND INTERNET ACCESS SERVICE COMPETITION.

Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report that—

(1) examines the efforts by the Federal Communications Commission to assess competition for providers of broadband Internet access service (as defined in section 8.2 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations) in the market;

(2) describes how the Commission can better assess competition; and

(3) includes a description of the steps, if any, the Commission can take to better increase competition among providers of broadband Internet access service (as defined in section 8.2 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations) in the market.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 294, the gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. DAVIDS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Kansas.

Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to the Save the Internet Act that helps the American consumer.

This amendment requires the Government Accountability Office to produce a report examining the FCC's efforts to assess competition in the wireline and wireless broadband internet access markets, and to tell us how the FCC can better assess competition in the future.

Driving competition in the telecommunications industry is good for innovation, consumer pricing, and availability of service. It only makes sense then that we should receive an accurate assessment of the FCC's current efforts to promote that competition and to ask the GAO how they might do it better.

I urge support for this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed to the amendment itself.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chair, I support the goal of this amendment in assessing the broadband marketplace and how the government can increase competition, lower prices, and improve the quality of service. This is a worthy subject for GAO to look into, and I think we can gain valuable insights.

This is something we could have approved in the Energy and Commerce Committee had it been brought to us, but we accept it here on the floor.

But if we were really looking for ways to increase competition, Mr. Chairman, in the wireless broadband marketplace, then I am baffled why Democrats did not find the need to examine how 5G networks will be severely threatened by their bill.

Numerous reports from entities not even in the tech space indicate that title II, this overreaching government takeover and the incredible power being given to the FCC to take charge of the internet, presents serious challenges to 5G deployment and its amazing potential for technical improvements.

These reports come from Barclays, which focuses on investment and banking, Oracle, and even the IEEE, which is the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, so it is not a bunch

of politicians talking about this, Mr. Chairman. These are certified smart people, otherwise known as the real engineers, that we went to.

To quote their analysis, "5G networks face the challenge of being developed in a context of high uncertainty, where most of the services that underpin 5G business models appear to be unlawful under current rules."

One example of the efficiencies that can be realized in a 5G network is network slicing which will allow operators to provide different services with different performance characteristics to address specific use cases. Because 5G is being designed for a wider range of use cases than prior technologies, it is critical that quality of service management be employed.

Applying net neutrality to these new 5G networks would cripple the performance of this incredible new technology.

Mr. GUTHRIE, a Republican from Kentucky, offered an amendment to address our serious concerns about the impact of the Democrats' bill on 5G, but that amendment to preserve the growth of 5G was not given an opportunity to be part of today's vote. Sadly, we can't even debate it. It is not here.

New 5G wireless networks will not only one day support apps and web pages, and texts, and chats, and video streams, but will also support a wide range of new technologies, from autonomous vehicles, augmented reality, innovations in healthcare delivery and education, to all other kinds of new advances, Mr. Chairman.

These new innovations, let alone the innovations beyond 5G to come, would be simply impossible, we now believe, and I think others believe independent of us, with these heavy-handed proposals that will result from title II power being given to bureaucrats in Washington. That is what the underlying bill would do.

It is worth remembering that until 2015, the Federal Communications Commission treated wireless networks differently when regulating net neutrality, because it did not want to impede the growth of a nascent technology. If we were to apply that same logic today, we should not burden developing 5G networks with onerous and outdated regulations, as these 5G networks are even more in their infancy than wireless was back in 2010, Mr. Chairman.

So we need to make sure that we don't handicap this next generation of technology with rules designed for rotary telephones that could cause us to delay or lose a global race to widely deploy 5G.

Mr. Chairman, those are my remarks. I support the underlying amendment, the Davids amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman from Kansas

for this outstanding complementary amendment to a very important issue.

I am, I believe, very much supportive, and I am supportive of the idea of the GAO producing a report examining the FCC's efforts to assess competition. That is an important record that we in the Congress need, and it complements the Save the Internet Act which represents true net neutrality protections that are designed for today and tomorrow without loopholes.

The Save the Internet Act includes enhanced transparency protections and enacts specific rules against blocking, throttling, and paid prioritization.

Additionally, the Save the Internet Act empowers the FCC to stop internet service providers from undermining the net neutrality principles through new and harmful mechanisms, but we want to work with those providers.

My colleague just mentioned 5G. Nothing that we do here is going to inhibit, I believe, the opportunity for us to work together.

Ms. DAVIDS' amendment is a vital and important contribution to the idea of competition, and the idea of serving your area, and making sure that we understand how the competition is increased in wireline and wireless broadband internet access to many markets.

I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I support her amendment, and I support the underlying bill, which is the Save the Internet Act, and I thank Mr. DOYLE for his leadership over the years in this legislation.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I don't have any other speakers, I don't believe. I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE).

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

It is interesting to hear my good friend talk about 5G. When the majority talks about government control of the internet, they should turn their eyes to the White House and the President's plan to nationalize 5G.

The only socialist plan to take over the internet is the one coming from the Trump administration and their plan to nationalize 5G. I have documents for the RECORD talking about numerous articles where the Trump administration proposes to nationalize 5G, and the plan coming from the administration to secure 5G.

The gentleman keeps saying that this bill is a government takeover of the internet, but the only government takeover I see is the one that the White House keeps proposing.

Now, the amendment that is before us would ask the GAO to examine how the FCC assesses competition, including making recommendations on how to improve their assessment and how to increase competition in these vital markets. This is a key question for so

many consumer protections online, not just net neutrality.

This bill is about consumers, small business, and democratic values like competition. This is a good amendment. I support this amendment, and I urge all of my colleagues to support it as well.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, I would recommend that my friend from Pennsylvania read this Barclays piece on what the bill likely could do to diminish the growth in 5G build-out, which I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From Barclays, U.S. Cable, Telecom & Internet, March 25, 2019]

NET NEUTRALITY: BLUNT TOOL FOR A FAST-CHANGING ECOSYSTEM

More heat than light in present Net Neutrality debate: While Net Neutrality and related issues have evoked strong passions since the early 2000s, very little of the discussion has evolved despite significant technological and economic shifts. The issue has come back into focus with House Democrats introducing a new bill to reinstate the 2015 Internet Order which was repealed by the FCC post the election of President Trump. The issue is also making its way through the courts with 20+ states and tech companies predictably suing against the FCC's repeal. Therefore, this issue is likely to remain in the headlines especially given elections next year.

Reinstating 2015 Open Internet Order may make it tough to realize full potential of 5G: We believe that Net Neutrality formulations as proposed in Congress are blunt tools to deal with a fast-changing technological landscape. The entire premise of 5G is the ability to enable different network capabilities for different applications. The 5G standards development body, 3GPP, has outlined three major use cases for the technology: enhanced Mobile Broadband, Massive IoT, and ultra-reliable low latency. While all three are likely to be used for consumer-facing applications, two of the three major use cases are also being targeted at industrial users. Dimensions of data use will also be more varied than just speed or volume. Some applications will need to transmit small amounts of data at constant periods (e.g. smart meters) while others will need bursts of high bandwidth consuming traffic (e.g. fixed wireless). Therefore, if implemented, the 2015 Open Internet Order framework (ban on paid prioritization and throttling) without accounting for emerging technological capabilities and applications is likely to become a roadblock to 5G monetization.

Title II could have a bigger operational impact than Net Neutrality: While the Open Internet Order has implications for future business models, if adopted as law, a more immediate concern for Internet service providers will be the push to redefine broadband as a Title II service. Operationally, this could constrain the degrees of freedom around variables such as pricing a lot more than the Open Internet Order itself.

Overall, while the need for some framework on Net Neutrality is agreed to by both sides of the political divide, the current set of proposals are, in our view, inadequate with material limitations on future business models. The issue requires a comprehensive

look at the entire value chain including the edge, but divided regulatory jurisdictions and a split Congress make this difficult to achieve. Therefore, for now, we believe the issue will be resolved by courts and is likely to be a headline risk for telecom and cable companies.

While Net Neutrality evokes strong passions politically, very little of the discussion has evolved despite significant technological and economic shifts. We believe that Net Neutrality formulations as they exist today are blunt tools to deal with a fast-changing technological landscape.

For instance, the entire premise of 5G is the ability to enable different network capabilities for different applications. The 5G standard development body has outlined three major use cases for the technology: enhanced Mobile Broadband (eMBB), Massive IoT (mIoT) and ultra-reliable low latency (URLLC). While all three are likely to be used for consumer facing applications, two of the three major use cases are also being targeted at industrial users (mIoT and URLLC). Data use across these applications is likely to be quite varied. For instance, smart meters will need to transmit small amounts of data at constant periods while consumer broadband works on bursts of high bandwidth consuming traffic such as video. Applications such as autonomous cars and remote surgery may value lower latency and higher edge computing capacity compared to, for example, checking email or watching video.

This is quite different from previous generations of wireless standards which thus far have been largely focused on consumer applications. The way Congress appears to be looking at Net Neutrality today or the way the FCC has looked at this in the past would effectively result in operators being forced to provide the same level of service to every application which will not only result in waste but also limit the impact of 5G. In fact, if the promise of 5G is realized the way it has been outlined by operators globally, the whole meaning of what a telecom 'service' means (is it latency? is it speed? is it edge compute?) and how it is measured is likely to change meaningfully.

Some conditions included in the 2015 Order such as paid prioritization and throttling could in theory make it impossible to deploy and monetize some of the features that make 5G a bigger shift than prior generations. In a 5G world, this would make it impossible in theory to prioritize latency for, as an example, a driverless car versus somebody watching Netflix. Of course regulators can fine-tune these definitions but that is not what the House bill seeks to do. It effectively passes this judgment to an administrative body—the FCC. Given that FCC decisions on this issue have been split along political affiliations of the Commissioners, every regime at the FCC could make opposing decisions making the implementation of any policy next to impossible. This opens up the entire issue to a lot of uncertainty which is likely to limit the ability of service providers to formulate go-to-market plans for 5G.

We also believe that the Net Neutrality framework as of today (no prioritization, no blocking and no throttling) is without any nuance to deal with what might be legitimate and consumer-friendly use cases. For instance, Netflix alone consumes ~19% of downstream bandwidth (wireless and wired) in the US today. In the early days of cable, when bandwidth in the cable pipe was limited due to analog signals, content networks had to pay cable companies for carriage. This allowed a market-based mechanism for viable networks to effectively 'buy' bandwidth and scale their services based on how widely they were distributed. Netflix how-

ever doesn't have to worry about this dynamic. It can make its technology decisions independent of the investment needs of the network. In theory, Netflix can decide to stream all its videos in 4K and suck up even more bandwidth, which will be to the detriment of other applications on the Internet and force cable and wireless companies to increase their network investment. At the same time, cable companies will have to deal with broadband price monitoring by the FCC (which the 2015 Open Internet Order enables), limiting their ability to pass through price to the consumer or to Netflix (due to a ban on paid prioritization).

Overall, while the need for some framework on Net Neutrality is unquestionable, the move by the House to just pass the buck back to the FCC to deal with the details is not the right answer in our opinion. This needs a legislative solution on the scale of the 1996 Telecommunications Act but this is almost impossible in the current environment. As a result, we believe this issue is likely to remain unresolved for a long time to come. Near-term, however, if this legislation were to pass, it could have a bigger impact on wireless 5G plans than on wireline operators.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chair, I would also point out, actually, that the bill would regulate 5G. We had a vote in committee to prevent that from happening, and every Democrat on the committee voted to regulate 5G through this legislation and give the FCC that authority, and every Republican voted the other way, because we actually vote for open and free internet and markets.

I know that the gentleman, my friend, was pretty busy when the President's people made their statement. I commented that day that I didn't think that was a good approach. So I have been on record, and I think most of my colleagues have as well. That is kind of an argument that, Mr. Chairman, I don't think holds much water.

What we do know is, we are legislating today, and the Democrats' legislation will regulate 5G, and the people who evaluate the effect of that say that is going to harm development, rollout, and probably investment as well.

Mr. Chair, the underlying amendment is good, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. DAVIDS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. STANTON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in part A of House Report 116-37.

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 4. ENGAGEMENT AND OUTREACH IN INDIAN COUNTRY REGARDING THE IMPORTANCE OF ADDRESSING THE UNIQUE BROADBAND INTERNET ACCESS SERVICE CHALLENGES.

(a) ENGAGEMENT WITH TRIBAL COMMUNITIES TO ADDRESS BROADBAND INTERNET ACCESS

SERVICE NEEDS.—Not later than 3 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Communications Commission shall engage with and obtain feedback from Tribal stakeholders and providers of broadband Internet access service (as defined in section 8.2 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations) on the effectiveness of the Commission's obligation to consult with Indian Tribes to determine whether the Commission needs to clarify the Commission's Tribal engagement statement and ensure accessible and affordable broadband Internet access service (as defined in section 8.2 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations) in the Tribal lands and areas through the engagement and outreach.

(b) **FINDINGS.**—The Congress finds the following:

(1) According to an estimate from the U.S. Census Bureau, just 53% of Native Americans living on Tribal lands have access to high-speed internet service.

(2) The Government Accountability Office has found that the Federal Communications Commission data has overstated broadband availability and access on Tribal lands in the United States.

(3) A Federal court recently vacated a Federal Communications Commission order that limited Federal subsidies for wireless providers serving Tribal lands.

(4) The United States Government, industry, and non-governmental organizations should do more to identify and address the unique broadband access challenges faced by individuals living on reservations and Tribal lands.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 294, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STANTON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Chairman, access to high-speed internet is absolutely essential in today's economy. It is the key component to our Nation's innovation infrastructure.

Yet, on Tribal lands across this country, a digital divide exists. According to the estimate from the U.S. Census Bureau, only 53 percent of Native Americans living on Tribal lands have access to high-speed internet, compared to 82 percent of households nationally.

A recent report by the Government Accountability Office examined how the Federal Communications Commission collects, validates, and uses data on broadband availability. It found that the FCC overstates the availability of broadband internet service on Tribal lands.

For example, if a service provider reports that it could provide broadband service internet access to at least one location in a census block, the FCC considers broadband to be "available" in that census block. That doesn't make much sense, and the GAO agreed.

It found that the FCC's available status is applied too broadly, sometimes including communities without infrastructure that connects homes to a service provider's network.

It also found that the FCC does not collect information on factors such as affordability, quality, and denials of service. FCC data that accurately cap-

tures the availability of broadband is critical because the Federal Government relies on the data to make important investments.

Without accurate data, the Federal Government will have difficulties identifying the true needs and cannot make appropriate investments. Part of the challenge in the lack of reliable data stems from the lack of meaningful consultation and engagement with Tribal Nations.

Tribal consultation is more than just checking a box. It is important for the FCC to not only listen to Tribes, but to actively engage and learn from them. Only by doing so will we be better able to get information on where the needs are. That will lead to better decisions and better outcomes.

My amendment would implement one of the GAO's recommendations. It would direct the FCC to seek feedback from Tribal stakeholders and providers on the effectiveness of its Tribal consultation, as well as ensure accessible and affordable broadband on Tribal lands.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 0930

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I share similar concerns to Mr. STANTON about promoting broadband deployment on Tribal lands. I have visited a number of reservations around the country, including in Arizona, as well as, of course, in my own State of Oregon and elsewhere.

This is a big issue, and the data are not complete. I agree with you that we need to do better. In fact, that is true, and I think we would all agree that the data the FCC gets, has, and uses has been a problem for a very long time. We have to get better so that when we allocate these funds to do the build-out and everything else, we are getting funds to the people who really need them. That is especially a problem with our Native American friends.

In fact, while I was presiding over the Energy and Commerce Committee last Congress, we accomplished landmark legislation with the enactment of RAY BAUM'S Act. That reauthorized the FCC, and it included language to improve services on Tribal lands, Mr. Chairman.

We need to make sure that the policies we impose on the internet support broadband deployment, especially deployment in Tribal, rural, and very rural areas. Oftentimes, the Tribal areas consist of rural areas where we have very small internet service providers providing access to the internet, and they are desperately trying to find

funding to expand their service footprint.

I was a small business owner with my wife for more than 20 years. I will tell you, you are trying to grow your small business, and then the government comes in and says: Oh, we want more information. We want more requirements. And we are going to regulate you more.

Mr. Chairman, all that does is take your money and your plan to invest and diverts it. You don't get to do as much as you had planned to do. That is why I supported an amendment to the underlying bill that would have specifically protected a small business from the heavy hand of overreporting.

That amendment would have included the language of my bill on small businesses that was passed unanimously by the House in each of the last two Congresses—unanimously, right here on this floor. It would have extended the exemption for small ISPs from President Obama's FCC's enhanced transparency rules for 5 years and expanded the exemption to include businesses with 250,000 subscribers or less.

This was based on a bipartisan compromise that the FCC's original exemption was not enough to protect small ISPs. We all agreed to that. We negotiated that and twice passed that unanimously in the House.

I agree that all consumers should be protected, but the enhanced transparency rules could deter broadband from being deployed further on Tribal lands and reaching consumers in the first place. That is because these enhanced disclosures place an unnecessary regulatory burden on small businesses and distract them from working to bring broadband internet access to customers across the country, especially on Tribal lands.

As a reminder, my amendment would not have let ISPs skirt transparency. It did not do that. We are just talking about really costly reporting requirements. Instead, they would follow the less onerous transparency rules adopted by the FCC back in 2010 so consumers would still have access to information needed to make informed decisions about their internet service, and ISPs could focus on providing service rather than cumbersome regulatory requirements.

There is bipartisan consensus in improving broadband deployment to Tribal lands and, I think, our rural areas and our urban areas that are underserved. But it seems my colleagues across the aisle don't support this as much as we claim and they claim. Otherwise, I would have expected the amendment I had, which reflected exactly what we twice agreed to, to be part of the underlying bill. It is not, and that is unfortunate. But Mr. STANTON's work is valuable, and I support it.

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

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments from Congressman WALDEN.

I would say, in this particular case with this particular amendment, this is not the government asking for information from entities that don't want to provide it. Just the opposite, the Tribal communities in my State and across the United States of America want to provide this information and want this very detailed consultation with the FCC so that we can provide better investments on Tribal lands.

This is a situation where government involvement is very much welcomed by the entities that we are asking the FCC to better consult with. This is welcome government intervention.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE).

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would say to my good friend, Mr. WALDEN, and he is my good friend, that if you think the President's plan to nationalize 5G is a bad idea—and I kind of recall the gentleman saying that. As recently as yesterday, the administration in its campaign is still talking about nationalizing 5G. Perhaps it is time to get on the phone or to stand up here on the House floor publicly and talk about some action that we can take as a Congress to make sure that the White House doesn't nationalize 5G.

With the amendment before us, bridging the digital divide is one of the great challenges the FCC faces today. The Save the Internet Act is going to give the FCC new tools to address that digital divide.

Although broadband technologies keep getting better, they are not reaching everyone, especially those in remote areas, like Native Americans living on Tribal lands. These populations face unique challenges in getting high-speed internet access service. That is why it is critical that the FCC focus on identifying and addressing obstacles to getting high-speed internet onto reservations and Tribal lands.

This amendment would instruct the FCC to work more closely with Native Americans to help connect Tribal lands. This amendment is particularly important because of the Trump FCC's illegal attempt to reduce support for the Lifeline program to Tribal communities. This decision was ultimately found to be illegal by the courts. However, it is critical that the Commission talk and listen to the people who understand the problems and represent the communities lacking broadband.

Mr. Chairman, I support this commonsense amendment.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I will be brief here. The only effort to nationalize 5G and to fully regulate 5G is contained in the Democrats' bill. That is where it is happening.

We had an amendment in the Rules Committee to prevent that, and the

Democrats who control the Rules Committee by a 2-to-1 margin refused to even allow us to debate that amendment here on the floor.

Finally, the President never said he was going to nationalize 5G. Somebody leaked a memo out of the White House that said that is a good idea. I oppose that. Right that same day, within hours, they had been clear on that.

Let's be clear here. The facts of the matter are that this legislation nationalizes and regulates 5G like it has never been done before and threatens innovation and development of this exciting new opportunity for American consumers.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from the great State of California (Mr. McCARTHY), who is the Republican leader.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask a simple yet important question, a question more and more Americans are beginning to ask: What have the Democrats done with their majority?

This Friday marks the 100th day of the new Democratic majority, 100 days of Democratic disappointment.

Today, we were supposed to debate the Democrats' shell budget, but Speaker PELOSI pulled it. So here we are, debating another bill that is dead on arrival in the Senate.

The numbers speak for themselves. At this point in the last Congress, Republicans had passed 141 bills out of committee and 132 out of the House.

We all believe in accountability, so what do the numbers say now? By contrast, Democrats have passed 68 bills out of committee and 97 out of the House, considerably fewer bills out of this House than before.

But think about this: Democrats have passed more bills out of the House than they have out of the committee. So much for doing the job of the people's House. No. It is whatever leadership decides.

Mr. Chairman, we have been lectured countless times by Speaker PELOSI over the years, and you all know the comments: Show us your budget, show us your values.

It hasn't been said once, it has been said hundreds of times: Show us your budget, show us your values.

The Speaker and I have disagreements, but I agree that passing a budget is the fundamental responsibility of the majority. That is not what we are doing today. Unfortunately, it looks like we will never know the true values of this majority because there is no budget.

Mr. Chairman, the problem goes beyond the Democrats' lack of results. As a majority, the Democrats have focused on three principles above all else: resolutions, radicalism, and resistance.

One in five votes in this House that has been taken since the end of January were nonbinding messaging resolutions. Just last week, we wasted time debating a symbolic resolution on

healthcare. Imagine for a moment if we had instead spent one-fifth of our time actually working to lower premiums, expand choice, or improve quality. Imagine all that we could have achieved.

Right now, we have a humanitarian crisis along our southern border. What if we spent one-fifth of our time working to improve border security and fix the loopholes in our immigration system?

No, Mr. Chairman. Democrats would rather consider another nonbinding resolution.

I have never known anybody who has run for office who was asked to make sure you go to Congress to waste time on votes that do not matter. They send us here to deliver solutions, not resolutions.

Mr. Chairman, the American people deserve better.

Perhaps the Democratic majority is so focused on resolutions because they don't want the American people to understand the consequences of their radical, extremist policies.

The Wall Street Journal wrote: "Democrats are embracing policies that include government control of ever-larger chunks of the private American economy."

Or, as I like to say, if you like the welfare state, you will love the Democratic agenda.

Take the Green New Deal. Under the guise of fighting climate change, it will lead to government control over nearly every element of our lives. What it wouldn't do is make housing more available or even energy more affordable for hardworking families.

How about Medicare for All? How do you like a one-size-fits-all healthcare system where government bureaucrats, not consumers, decide what benefits you are going to receive?

Mr. Chairman, do you know that more than 100 Democrats in the majority have cosponsored this bill? So not only do they support it, they crave it to come to the floor.

What would it do? It would end private insurance. That means 158 million Americans would lose their insurance. And everybody on Medicare Advantage? Gone.

That is what they worked on these first 100 days.

Your doctor? Gone.

Your hospital? Gone.

Your healthcare plan? Gone.

On issue after issue, Democrats seem to have but one solution: more spending, more bureaucracy, and more government control.

Mr. Chairman, the American public deserves better.

Finally, you can learn a lot about this majority by seeing the bills they refused to consider these first 100 days.

After spending weeks unwilling to condemn anti-Semitic remarks, you would think House Democrats would rush to schedule real legislation. We have a bill sitting at the Speaker's desk right now that would take concrete steps to counter the growing boycott, divestment, sanctions movement

against our greatest ally in the Middle East, Israel. You would think that, Mr. Chairman, but that would be wrong.

You would think that after the Virginia Governor made comments that seemed to support infanticide, House Democrats would rush to schedule the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. Remember, this bill simply ensures that all babies, regardless of when they are born, receive the medical care they deserve as human beings. Yet for the 31st time—no exaggeration, 31 times we have asked on this floor for unanimous consent to bring that bill up—Democrats have refused.

That is what they spent 100 days on. They refuse to defend newborns from infanticide because they are beholden to the most extreme factions of their own party.

Mr. Chairman, the American people deserve better.

The only unifying theme of the Democrats' 100 days has been their nonstop resistance to President Trump. For 2 years, Democrats insisted that the President colluded with Russia to win the 2016 election. Their own chairman of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the one who is supposed to see and protect us, told the American public in 2017 that there was more than circumstantial evidence to prove it.

Yet when the Mueller report found no evidence of collusion, Democrats refused to accept the conclusion. They refused to do anything to ADAM SCHIFF who had lied to the American public for the last 2 years. They didn't apologize for misleading the public either.

No, without missing a beat and aided by the liberal media, they simply opened up new investigations. That is what they did for their 100 days.

Who pays for these endless investigations? You, the hardworking taxpayer. The Democrats are happy to continue to run up the tab and never bring a budget to the floor to show their values.

□ 0945

Mr. Chair, the American public deserves better.

Today, the Democrats are leaving for their Member retreat and then a 2-week spring break. Let's hope they come back with more than a tan. Let's hope they come back with a new game plan. Let's hope they come back ready to work for the common good, not simply to appease their extremist, radical base.

Now, we are ready and eager to work with Democrats. We are ready to work with Democrats to secure our border. We are ready to work with Democrats to upgrade our infrastructure. We are ready to work with Democrats to lower the cost of prescription drugs and address the opioid crisis.

We stand ready to work with anyone to solve the problems our country faces, in the next 100 days and beyond. After 100 days, please, Mr. Chair, let's get to work. The American people deserve nothing less.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. NEGUSE). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STANTON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. TRONE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in part A of House Report 116-37.

Mr. TRONE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 4. ACCURACY OF DATA UNDERLYING BROADBAND DEPLOYMENT REPORTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The Commission has released reports on its inquiries under section 706(b) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (47 U.S.C. 1302(b)) that detail the state of the deployment of broadband service in the United States.

(2) Congress and the Commission have relied upon the accuracy of such reports to develop broadband policy.

(3) The findings of such reports have been particularly important to fostering rural broadband deployment and broadband deployment to schools and classrooms.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The Commission—

(1) may not release a report on an inquiry under section 706(b) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (47 U.S.C. 1302(b)) based on broadband deployment data that the Commission knows to be inaccurate; and

(2) shall use its best efforts to accurately detail broadband deployment in the United States and correct inaccuracies in statements made by the Commission prior to the release of a report about the report.

(c) COMMISSION DEFINED.—In this section, the term “Commission” means the Federal Communications Commission.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 294, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. TRONE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. TRONE. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In 21st century America, having reliable, high-speed internet broadband isn't a luxury; it is a necessity. Just like running water or electricity, it is part of our essential infrastructure, yet millions of Americans in rural communities, including some in my district in western Maryland, remain disconnected from the internet.

That lack of connectivity leads to homework gaps, healthcare gaps, and economic development gaps. It is our job in Congress to eliminate those gaps.

The Federal Communications Commission is required to report accurate data to the public so that we can make effective decisions about rural broadband infrastructure policy and investment.

But there is strong evidence that the percentage of Americans without broadband access is much higher than the FCC's numbers indicate.

In order to justify Chairman Pai's deregulation agenda, the FCC released highly flawed and misleading data that paints a false picture of broadband deployment in rural America.

We now know the FCC's data was based on a massive error that was brought to his attention before the FCC disseminated the press release touting their success. That kind of deception could lead to millions of our neighbors in rural America being locked out of this critical good.

This amendment seeks to address this issue by, one, prohibiting the FCC from releasing a report based on information it knows to be inaccurate; and, two, specifying the Commission must use its best efforts to ensure all future reports are accurate, and they must correct past inaccuracies prior to the release of new data on broadband deployment.

It is pretty simple. We need accurate information to make the best decisions regarding broadband deployment. Let's ensure we get that from the FCC moving forward, and then let's ensure every American has access to reliable high-speed broadband.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, but I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chair, I appreciate my colleague's concern about the accuracy of the FCC's reports on deployment. I share those. And with his broader concern about broadband generally, I agree with that.

In fact, many Members on both sides of the aisle share these concerns, especially when it comes to the unserved Americans in our most rural areas, like my district that would stretch from the Atlantic to Ohio. It is a big district.

So, I will support this amendment. However, I would ask my colleagues to seriously consider, Mr. Chairman, the negative impacts of giving the FCC power to regulate rates on rural broadband deployment.

Mr. KINZINGER's amendment to block any sort of rate regulation was actually blocked by the majority from being considered today, and that is unfortunate.

At the full committee markup, Mr. KINZINGER highlighted a memo from the Congressional Research Service that noted there is nothing permanent to the forbearance that the majority claims to be doing when it comes to controlling the prices providers charge consumers.

So, we could get into rate regulation through the FCC, and every ISP would have to come back here and beg and explain their rate structure and everything else. And we have got thousands of them.

The majority attempted to remedy this flaw with some additional language purporting to lock in the FCC's forbearance on this matter, but the actual effect of that language is still unclear.

Most importantly, they left open the broad authority of sections 201 and 202 of the Communications Act and other authority that gives the Federal Communications Commission, all five unelected officials, plenty of leeway to regulate rates under title II.

The legislation we have before us clearly leaves the door open to rate regulation. If this were not the case, then the Kinzinger amendment, I would think, would be before the House today or would have been approved in committee when we had a chance to do that.

This is no way to conduct business in the internet age. These title II regulations were originally implemented for railroad monopolies in the 19th century. So, if you really believe in a competitive, open marketplace and a competitive, open internet, you don't turn it over to unelected bureaucrats in Washington to micromanage.

As they were applied in their original incarnation, the requirements of just and reasonable practices under section 201(b) and no unreasonable discrimination under 202(a)—which, by the way, sound perfect—provided sufficient authority to impose price controls on railroads.

So, by opening the door with title II and these other sections of law, you are now giving this vast power to basically three unelected officials at the FCC. You just need a majority to decide how the whole internet runs. I think that is a problem.

Mr. Chair, I support the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TRONE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Chairman, good policy simply needs good data. We need accurate, reliable information to target our policies and resources as effectively as possible.

This amendment simply ensures reports issued by the FCC are accurate, and we should all be able to agree on that. And I thank the gentleman for that.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I have no other speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TRONE. Mr. Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE).

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chair, the Save the Internet Act will ensure net neutrality and help

bring the internet to parts of the country that don't yet have it.

I would say to my friend from Oregon, the bill is crystal clear on rate regulation. The language clearly prohibits any rate regulation, so rural folks need not worry about that.

Through the act, the FCC will have the authority to accelerate deployment of broadband by removing barriers to infrastructure investment and by promoting competition. And, furthering that goal, Congress requires that the FCC report on the state of broadband deployment nationwide.

The results, every year, are particularly important because they are used to figure out where to best direct funds for rural broadband deployment. And to name a few, that is important for consumers, schools, libraries, and hospitals that they get the connections they need.

And we need to know that the FCC's data is accurate. We expect the FCC to use its best efforts to ensure that the data is up to date and error free before releasing their reports.

Recently, the traditional diligence of the FCC has been called into question. According to news reports, the FCC is preparing a report that contains data that an internet service provider has told the FCC is wrong. The carrier reported that it provided high-speed broadband to everyone in 10 states when its actual service area was a fraction of that.

This serious oversight seriously alters the state of broadband deployment in this country and calls into question data used by this administration to justify other policies.

Despite that internet service provider coming forward, the FCC has not even corrected a press statement that was, in part, based on that erroneous data entitled "America's Digital Divide Narrows Substantially."

As the expert agency regulating broadband, it cannot knowingly put out false information that misleads the public. This amendment will help remedy that. That is why I support it, and that is why I think we should all vote for it.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chair, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon has 2½ minutes remaining.

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

Again, I appreciate the gentleman's amendment. As I said, I intend to support it. We need the facts here, and I support getting the facts.

We know the reporting data we often get is not accurate. And, if people are lying about their data, then we should hold them accountable, and I'll join you in that effort. That is not acceptable.

On the issue of rate regulation, that is what title II is all about. That is what this bill gives the FCC the authority to do.

While you can argue that adopting the forbearances that the FCC did

under title II when they had that authority may preclude rate regulation there, by giving them this enormous authority, your own counsel testified in answer to our question, that they could go through a standard rule-making process and use sections 201 and 202 to do their own rate regulation.

You see, you may close the front door, but you left the back door open. Actually, you created a back door.

That is where I am concerned, and my side is concerned that you are empowering the FCC with these incredible authorities designed for monopoly railroads and designed for monopoly communications systems that could really hamper future investment in things like 5G and provide all this micromanagement of the internet and harm consumers. That is why so many of us oppose this particular provision.

I keep seeing Republicans on this floor, Mr. Chairman, accept the Democrats' amendments in almost every case. They blocked some of ours from being able to be considered.

But, when it comes to this fundamental issue of turning the internet over to the Federal Government and three unelected people to do incredible things that aren't good for the long-term benefit of consumers and new technologies, we have to remain opposed.

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

Mr. TRONE. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. TRONE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. BRINDISI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in part A of House Report 116-37.

Mr. BRINDISI. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 4 GAO REPORT ON HIGH-SPEED INFRASTRUCTURE.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress and the Federal Communications Commission a report that contains—

(1) a list of ways the Federal Government can promote the deployment of broadband Internet access service, especially the build-out of such service to rural areas and areas without access to such service at high speeds; and

(2) recommendations with respect to policies and regulations to ensure rural areas are provided affordable access to broadband Internet access service.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) BROADBAND INTERNET ACCESS SERVICE.—The term "broadband Internet access service" has the meaning given such term in section 8.2 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations.

(2) RURAL AREA.—The term "rural area" means any area other than—

(A) a city, town, or incorporated area that has a population of more than 20,000 inhabitants; or

(B) an urbanized area contiguous and adjacent to a city or town that has a population of more than 50,000 inhabitants.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 294, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BRINDISI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BRINDISI. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I would like to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his leadership on this important topic.

The free market is the cornerstone of America's economy, and this bill would ensure that free-market competition is protected on the internet.

However, for many Americans living in small towns, basic internet access remains out of reach. Too many homes in rural areas are not connected at all to high-speed broadband, and those that are online suffer from slow speeds and constant interruptions in service.

Customers see their bills go up month after month, and service just gets worse and worse.

Internet access is essential in today's economy, and we need to do more to connect rural areas to high-speed broadband.

My amendment would direct the Government Accountability Office to issue recommendations on how to expand broadband internet service in rural and other underserved areas. This information will help guide our work on how to best expand broadband access in rural communities.

I urge adoption of my amendment, and I, again, thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his leadership on this bill and urge our colleagues to pass the underlying legislation.

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

□ 1000

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, again, I support this amendment to require the GAO to look into ways to promote deployment of broadband to our most rural and underserved areas. It is a very worthy subject and one on which I think we can find some really broad bipartisan agreement. It is a top priority of mine and has been, so I won't oppose the amendment.

We are obviously delegating a lot of authority to the GAO, which is a wonderful organization, but we all have had hearings and know what really needs to happen, I think, going forward to get broadband built out. However, if you are really concerned about deployment to rural and underserved areas,

you should be extremely concerned about the impact the underlying bill is going to have on our ability to get broadband out to these areas and close the digital divide.

Title II is a proven investment killer, period, hard stop. This is shown not only in the overall nationwide investment numbers going down during the only 2-year blip these rules were in effect. Remember, my colleague from New York, these internet rules you are about only existed for less than about 2 years. That is it.

The whole growth, the expansion of the internet and broadband occurred during the period of the 1990s to 2015. Then the internet order was put in and investment went down, and then the internet order was repealed and investment is going up.

The head of the Eastern Oregon Telecom Company, Joe Franell, came back to Washington and testified before our subcommittee and said, under title II, his investors lost interest; deals dried up; the bank wouldn't even give him a loan. It was an extremely compelling story from somebody who is on the front lines of getting broadband built out to the very areas you and I would agree need service.

And we heard from many other small rural ISPs as well with the same stories. They are the ones that take the worst hit under title II that is in this bill you support.

Now, I submitted an amendment to the Rules Committee to do something real to address the worst uncertainties that these small carriers have to deal with under title II.

Title II opens the door to government control of private networks. It opens the door to government taxation of the internet. It opens the door to government regulation of speech online.

My amendment would have closed all of those doors. Unfortunately, the Democrats, again, who control the Rules Committee, Mr. Chairman, 2 to 1, would not find a way to even allow us to bring that amendment here for a vote or debate.

I have to say, under title II, our smallest rural ISPs would have a really tough time, and we have seen a lot of evidence of this in the past. So I hope my friends will consider that, when we are voting on this underlying bill, we are actually going to cause those small ISPs more harm than good, and that will delay deployment into unserved and underserved communities.

A GAO study on deployment will have no impact whatsoever on deployment-killing excesses of title II, but it will give us some ideas about how to build out broadband, so I won't oppose the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRINDISI. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We keep hearing this talk about how investment plummeted after the 2015

order. Well, we all know that is not true, and the proof is in the pudding.

Investment data shows an aggregate increase in investment following the FCC's February 2015 vote to adopt the open internet rules compared to the 2 years following the repeal of the 2015 order, when investment actually decreased.

The same is true of most ISPs' individual investments. The majority of publicly traded broadband providers reported investment increases after the 2015 order was adopted. In the first year following adoption of the 2015 rules, census data showed a \$3.5 billion jump in capital spending in data processing, hosting, and related services.

Moreover, the repeal of the 2015 order did not result in a use boost to infrastructure spending, as the Trump FCC asserted would happen. Instead, investment actually decreased.

This amendment before us is important. Though many of our constituents enjoy easy access to high-speed broadband, there are still many pockets of this country that aren't served by high-speed broadband. Or, as my good friend PETER WELCH from the great State of Vermont says about the promises of 5G: "Some of us have no Gs."

The Save the Internet Act is going to restore net neutrality throughout the country, and it is going to give the FCC key authorities that buttress critical programs, such as the Connect America Fund that provides money to build high-speed broadband out to areas where it would not be economic to do so without the funding.

The Save the Internet Act also gives internet service providers nondiscriminatory access to rights of way and poles, which will facilitate build-out in rural areas.

Unless we connect our rural communities, the people in them cannot fully be active participants in the 21st century economy. They are missing out on education and workforce opportunities that are so often now delivered online. That is why much of the rural broadband deployment in this country is funded by the Connect America Fund.

This amendment would require GAO to examine these issues and to provide a report with recommendations about how the government can promote build-out to hard-to-reach or otherwise overlooked communities. This is such an important policy issue and such an important part of saving the internet.

I look forward to joining my colleagues in supporting this amendment.

Mr. BRINDISI. Mr. Chairman, I again urge adoption of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to how much time remains.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon has 2¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chair, I appreciate both my colleagues' comments, but the nationwide numbers of investment obscure what happens in our smallest investors, among those that are out

there, like Joe Franell in Eastern Oregon trying to build out.

What we do know is he came back and testified to the problem he encountered individually as one who is very progressive and active, trying to connect really difficult places to get to with the highest speed broadband possible.

I have met with him before; I have met with him during; I have met with him afterwards. He came back on his own dime to make the case that, when these rules were in effect, he had difficulty getting loans; he had difficulty building out; he was burdened more than he had ever been before, and that diminished his ability to build out.

His numbers probably are dust in terms of investment that the big companies have, but that is who I care about are the little operators that are so pushed down by this heavy hand of government overregulation. So that is, I think, what we have to maintain our focus on.

Again, title II gives these vast unprecedented powers to the FCC to regulate the internet like it has never been regulated before. People who have no Gs need our help, but people waiting for 5G don't need us to pass legislation that will screw it up and diminish innovation, and that is one of the reasons I am opposing this version of net neutrality.

We could agree on no throttling and no blocking and the paid prioritization issue as well.

The other thing I found interesting, Mr. Chairman, is, throughout the course of all of our hearings, there wasn't a witness panel of people who had faced all of these parade of horrors we have heard about from ISPs.

There weren't any witnesses. They didn't bring anybody. I don't know if they are out there or not. They didn't bring anybody who has been affected by the edge providers, however, and that is another subject for our conversation going forward.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BRINDISI). The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MS. SPANBERGER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in part A of House Report 116-37.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 4. GAO REPORT ON CHALLENGES TO ACCURATE MAPPING.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(1) determine the accuracy and granularity of the maps produced by the Federal Communications Commission that depict wireline and wireless broadband Internet access service deployment in the United States; and

(2) submit to Congress a report that—

(A) identifies—

(i) any program of the Federal Communications Commission under a rule restored under section 2(b) that relies on such maps, including any funding program; and

(ii) any action of the Federal Communications Commission taken under a rule restored under section 2(b) that relies on such maps, including any assessment of competition in an industry; and

(B) provides recommendations for how the Federal Communications Commission can produce more accurate, reliable, and granular maps that depict wireline and wireless broadband Internet access service deployment in the United States.

(b) BROADBAND INTERNET ACCESS SERVICE DEFINED.—In this section, the term “broadband Internet access service” has the meaning given such term in section 8.2 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 294, the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Virginia.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of my commonsense broadband mapping amendment to H.R. 1644, the Save the Internet Act of 2019.

The digital gap between our rural and urban communities is real, and I hear about it from the people I serve every day.

According to the FCC's 2018 Broadband Deployment Report, more than 30 percent of rural Americans lack access to high-speed fixed broadband, compared to only 2 percent of urban Americans. This disparity has long-term implications for the economic strength and security of our country.

In rural America, a lack of reliable broadband internet makes it harder for businesses to find customers and attract new employees. Without reliable broadband internet, communities across this country face challenges attracting new businesses and investment.

In rural America, farmers have a tougher time using the latest precision agriculture technology, and in places without reliable broadband internet, kids find it difficult to complete their homework assignments.

In our district in central Virginia, farmers and producers are disadvantaged because the lack of broadband makes doing business harder. In our district, constituents drive their kids to McDonald's or to neighboring counties so that they can complete their research projects for school. And what is happening in our district is happening nationwide.

Today, we are considering a critical piece of legislation to champion the idea of a free and open internet.

There is no question that rural broadband internet access should be a part of this conversation, as this bill

would also include a provision to restore the FCC's authority to fund the expansion of broadband access across our rural communities. But right now, there are many questions surrounding the accuracy of the FCC's broadband internet maps, which detail which areas in the United States have high-speed internet coverage and which do not.

These maps have important implications for our rural communities, schools, and businesses. These maps are used to award funding and subsidies to expand broadband coverage to areas that don't have it, and, in many cases, these efforts have led to great success.

However, these maps have been found to be inaccurate, incomplete, or unreliable. Often a map will claim an entire area is covered by high-speed broadband when, in reality, only a small portion of that area has reliable coverage.

This trend should not be the status quo in our digital age because it leaves so many rural families underserved. Areas where the FCC's maps incorrectly say there is high-speed rural broadband connectivity are often ineligible for funding to expand broadband, and these inaccuracies greatly disadvantage our rural communities.

Erroneous information in these maps could be the difference between a senior citizen being able to access life-saving telemedicine services or not; it could be the difference between a farmer who can keep up with market fluctuations halfway across the world or not; and it could control the ability of a young, aspiring student to access online information, college applications, and research materials.

My amendment to the Save the Internet Act would address a lack of reliable broadband internet connectivity in our rural communities, and it would begin to fix the errors in our current broadband maps.

My amendment would require the Government Accountability Office to produce a full report that examines the accuracy and quality of the FCC's broadband mapping. This report would also identify what the FCC should do to produce more accurate, reliable, and high-quality maps.

Additionally, the GAO report required by my amendment would help identify the scope of the broadband mapping problem and actually suggest solutions. With this new information, the FCC would be better able to update its maps so that we can properly target our broadband expansion efforts to the rural towns, townships, and communities across our district.

Better maps of broadband coverage are a critical first step toward getting high-speed internet to every household, something we should aim to do in our globalized, digitally-focused economy. As we are having important discussions about protecting and expanding reliable access to the internet, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to H.R. 1644.

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I don't think I am opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I don't disagree with my colleague from Virginia that the maps showing broadband deployment in the United States can and must be improved. That is why, when Republicans held the majority for the Energy and Commerce Committee, we held numerous hearings on how to do that, how to improve broadband mapping at the FCC.

We also shared legislation with our Democratic—then minority—colleagues to bring in the expertise of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration to aggregate granular data beyond the carrier data that the FCC uses for its maps.

Unfortunately, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle didn't want to work with us to improve mapping last Congress. I am more hopeful this time that we can engage—we are ready, willing, and able to do so—and that we can address this matter.

Mapping is clearly important—I think we all agree on that—and it is where we should focus our limited Federal money on broadband support. But rather than help spur broadband deployment and provide more granular data, the underlying legislation would make it more difficult on broadband providers to deploy broadband.

We just discussed how investment in broadband, especially for our small providers, suffered under title II. They came and testified to that.

But my reservation on this amendment, Mr. Chairman, has to do with the conflict that I see between the Wexton amendment, No. 5, and the Spanberger amendment, No. 11. I wonder if the gentlewoman from Virginia would care to comment about that, and I would be happy to yield. I didn't have a chance to talk with her. It may not be fair.

The issue here is the Wexton amendment, which we did not oppose, requires the Federal Communications Commission to submit to Congress, within 30 days, a plan for how the Commission will evaluate and address problems with the collection of form 477 data.

□ 1015

I believe those are the same data we are talking about with your amendment to have the GAO do this investigation and report to Congress as well.

The conflict I see is, on the one hand, we are telling the FCC to go do its work and report back in 30 days, but in your amendment, we are telling the GAO to go do its work and tell us eventually where the problems are. They can do that, but we have already told the FCC to report back its answers.

I am not going to oppose the amendment, but it seems like there is kind of a conflict here, potentially. Because we want to get it right, it seems like we would wait to have the FCC report back until the GAO had completed its work. Then we could work with the FCC to say, okay, now that we know what the GAO has found and informed us on, then, FCC, go and report back.

I might have structured this a little differently had we had time to work out some of that.

I am not going to oppose the gentlewoman's amendment. We have to get the data right. We have to get the mapping right.

When the stimulus came out in the Obama administration, I argued this very point in the committee. We were in the minority then, so of course, I lost. But they were spending money that was being set aside in the stimulus to build out broadband in America before they had the maps to figure out where people were underserved and unserved.

It seemed kind of backward then, and I think it was. We didn't get the maps until after the money was allocated. The time to do the audits and evaluations of how that money was spent, the money for that ran out before the build-out was finished, so we had to come back to look at that. Then we did find limited cases of fraud and abuse, not much, frankly, but enough. It is taxpayer dollars.

I won't oppose the gentlewoman's amendment. I think we can work out these things if this bill were to move forward, but the timing is the issue that I have some reservations on.

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

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Chair, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Virginia has 1 minute remaining.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE).

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I would say to my friend, I think what we are trying to do in these two amendments is, we need the FCC to get on this as soon as possible, but we need the GAO to continue to look at this. But I understand what the gentleman is saying.

Look, we know these maps are wrong. I mean, nobody is arguing about that, and it is unacceptable. What the gentlewoman's amendment would do is ask the GAO to do a report to examine the current mapping processes for both wireless and wired line services.

They would also be asked to identify what FCC programs and actions rely on maps and to make recommendations on how the FCC could produce more reliable maps.

I think this is an important amendment. I support it, and I urge all my colleagues to support it also.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentlewoman's amendment and the gentleman's comments. We can figure out how to work this out, I think. But clearly, we have to fix the maps.

Even the industry has told me, at least—they admit the data, the way it is collected and everything else, is not an accurate representation. They would like our help in this as well.

Hopefully, we can move forward on an NTIA reauthorization as well. We marched through a number of agency reauthorizations and programmatic reauthorizations that hadn't been done in decades in the last 2 years. We should continue that important work as well. We stand ready as Republicans to join our colleagues to get that done.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. MCADAMS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in part A of House Report 116-37.

Mr. MCADAMS. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 4. LAWFUL CONTENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—As described in the Report and Order on Remand, Declaratory Ruling, and Order in the matter of protecting and promoting the open internet that was adopted by the Federal Communications Commission on February 26, 2015 (FCC 15-24)—

(1) nothing in this Act prohibits providers of broadband Internet access service from blocking content that is not lawful, such as child pornography or copyright-infringing materials; and

(2) nothing in this Act imposes any independent legal obligation on providers of broadband Internet access service to be the arbiter of what is lawful content.

(b) BROADBAND INTERNET ACCESS SERVICE DEFINED.—In this section, the term “broadband Internet access service” has the meaning given such term in section 8.2 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 294, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MCADAMS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. MCADAMS. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment to H.R. 1644, the Save the Internet Act.

As the father of four children, I worry about what my kids see on social media and online, and I know firsthand how important it is that illegal content doesn't pollute the internet.

My amendment would affirm that this bill preserves broadband internet

service providers' ability to block unlawful content, including disturbing and harmful materials like child pornography.

We are here today to vote on legislation to protect the internet as an engine of innovation and open communication free from undue restrictions, such as blocking legal content and services, throttling service, and paid prioritization of content. While the bill does not, as currently written, revoke service providers' ability to block illegal content, I believe the House can agree that we should nonetheless affirm our commitment to stopping unlawful behaviors, such as viewing child pornography and copyright infringement.

My amendment does not impose additional or onerous legal requirements on service providers to act as an arbiter of lawfulness but, rather, ensures providers can continue working with consumer watchdogs and law enforcement to keep our internet free from illegal content and to make it safe for our families.

Let me reiterate this amendment also does not grant ISPs any new rights to block content that is lawful or decide what is lawful on the internet. My amendment simply stands for the proposition that unlawful content is not protected by net neutrality rules.

It is one thing to say ISPs can block content subject to a valid court order and quite another to let ISPs make decisions about the lawfulness of content for themselves. This amendment strikes that balance.

We have bipartisan consensus on the tremendous value of the internet's contribution to our society's innovation and communication, and I also know that there is bipartisan concern about severe illegal misuses of the internet's power. I believe my amendment offers us an opportunity to confirm our support once again for a free internet with unfettered access to legal content and to our vehement opposition to child pornography.

Mr. Chair, I thank the members of the committee for their work on this legislation, and I urge a "yes" vote on my amendment.

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Oregon is recognized.

There was no objection.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I agree with my colleague across the aisle, Mr. McADAMS, that ISPs should be able to block unlawful content, and I support his amendment.

In fact, even when the FCC imposed the heavy-handed title II regulations, it recognized in paragraph 113 of its order that the ban on blocking did not "prevent or restrict a broadband pro-

vider from refusing to transmit unlawful material, such as child pornography or copyright-infringing materials."

This was similar to the FCC's earlier nonblocking rule, which was also affirmed, that ISPs could block material that was unlawful.

It strikes me as interesting that you have to have this amendment to apparently clarify an ambiguity some must feel exists in the underlying bill, but we will support it if it is necessary to do that.

I firmly support net neutrality that allows Americans to enjoy the lawful content on the internet and applications of their choosing.

I would point out to my friend from Utah that the concerns about social media, and I share them, are not covered by this legislation. Those big platforms are completely exempt, as near as we can tell, so that is another area where I think we all share a common bond, that there is concern about what goes on in social media, things that aren't legal, things that are fake. I mean, you name it.

Under title II, the FCC could police internet content, as it currently does with content broadcasts over television or radio. I was a radio broadcaster for 21 years, owned and operated stations, and that concerns me a bit if we are going to get the FCC being the Nation's speech police. By making further rules on the ISPs, you might be able to end up there. That is a concern.

This is a really broad, open-ended authority that you all are giving to the Federal Communications Commission. That is because the FCC did not forebear from some content-specific provisions of title II, such as section 223. That would give the FCC authority to impose content-based restrictions if it found it to be "just and reasonable." That goes well beyond just the legal content, I think.

I am not burdened with a law degree, but I have some really good lawyers that counsel me on these matters.

This is why we offered an amendment that would have put certain protections in place for consumers' freedom of speech online because that is also something we all swear to uphold, our First Amendment rights of religion and speech.

Rather than talk about how we can prevent the FCC from someday abusing the expansive authority that the majority is about to give it, we are here discussing something that has been universally agreed upon by all parties to this debate.

Mr. Chair, we appreciate the gentleman's perfecting amendment to this legislation. I intend to support it.

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

Mr. McADAMS. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. McADAMS. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chair, I would ask the Congressman, my understanding of his amendment is that it simply restates what is already in the 2015 Open Internet Order, namely, that nothing in this bill would prohibit ISPs from blocking unlawful content and that nothing in this act adds any additional requirement or right for an ISP to decide what is lawful content?

Mr. McADAMS. Mr. Chair, yes, that is correct. Nothing in this amendment grants any sort of new rights to an ISP. Rather, this amendment simply stands for the proposition that unlawful content is not protected by net neutrality rules. In other words, blocking unlawful content does not violate net neutrality.

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for clarifying that. I support the gentleman's amendment.

Since this is the last of the amendments to be offered, I wanted to take this time to thank my friend and the Republican side for a vigorous debate not only in our committee but here on the floor.

Mr. Chair, I would be remiss if I didn't thank our staffs, namely Alex Hoehn-Saric, Jerry Leverich, Jennifer Epperson, AJ Brown, Dan Miller, Kenneth Degraff, and my telecom staff, Philip Murphy. Without him, I wouldn't sound as intelligent as I do on these matters. I thank all of the Democratic staff. They worked very hard, and they deserve our thanks.

Mr. Chair, this has been a vigorous debate, as it should be, but we are coming to a close now, and I thank my friend for his participation.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I again thank the gentleman from Utah for bringing this amendment. I guess my suspicions were right: It is merely restating what is already in the 2015 order, which is what this bill basically reinstates into law.

Mr. Chair, I thank my staff as well for the great job they have done. I appreciate both sides as we work together on these complicated and sometimes controversial issues.

I would point out that, under sections 223 and 201, you are again opening the door to vast new regulation of speech and content, I believe and our attorneys believe, by giving the FCC this authority.

I am a First Amendment guy. I have a degree in journalism. I believe in free speech. Sometimes, I don't like that speech. Sometimes, I find it offensive. The stuff that is illegal, you bet, we are all together on. But there are some interesting stories coming out around Europe and elsewhere where countries now, especially some of those in the more authoritarian parts of the world, are using this argument to crack down on political speech they find offensive.

I think we have to be very careful as Republicans, as Democrats, as all

Americans to try to find that balance between the obvious and the speech that really is about protecting the powerful. I think we can find common ground on that, but I do wince a bit that we are opening the door, or you all are with your bill, to giving the FCC the power to tax the internet, the power to regulate speech on the internet by going through a rulemaking.

I think that heads us in a little more dangerous direction and, meanwhile, does not address some of the issues I hear in townhalls. I have done 20 of them in every county in my district this year. When people begin to step up and have issues, it is not the ISPs they are complaining about, other than speeds and connectivity, that sort of thing. It is what is happening on some of the social media platforms, which are not addressed by this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I support the gentleman's amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McADAMS. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. McADAMS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part A of House Report 116-37 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. DELGADO of New York.

Amendment No. 6 by Ms. WEXTON of Virginia.

Amendment No. 12 by Mr. McADAMS of Utah.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

□ 1030

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. DELGADO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. DELGADO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 363, noes 60, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 163]

AYES—363

Adams	Eshoo	Levin (MI)
Aderholt	Espallat	Lewis
Aguiar	Estes	Lieu, Ted
Allred	Evans	Lipinski
Armstrong	Finkenauer	Loeb
Arrington	Fitzpatrick	Lofgren
Axne	Fletcher	Long
Bacon	Flores	Loudermilk
Baird	Fortenberry	Lowenthal
Balderson	Foster	Lowey
Barr	Fox (NC)	Lucas
Barragán	Frankel	Luetkemeyer
Bass	Fudge	Lujan
Beatty	Gabbard	Luria
Bera	Gallagher	Lynch
Beyer	Gallego	Malinowski
Bilirakis	Garamendi	Maloney,
Bishop (GA)	Garcia (IL)	Carolyn B.
Blumenauer	Garcia (TX)	Maloney, Sean
Blunt Rochester	Gianforte	Mast
Bonamici	Gibbs	Matsui
Bost	Golden	McAdams
Boyle, Brendan	Gomez	McBath
F.	Gonzalez (OH)	McCarthy
Brady	Gonzalez (TX)	McCaul
Brindisi	González-Colón	McClintock
Brooks (IN)	(PR)	McCollum
Brown (MD)	Gottheimer	McGovern
Brownley (CA)	Granger	McHenry
Buchanan	Graves (LA)	McKinley
Bucshon	Graves (MO)	McNerney
Burgess	Green (TN)	Meadows
Bustos	Green (TX)	Meeks
Butterfield	Griffith	Meng
Byrne	Grijalva	Miller
Calvert	Grothman	Mitchell
Carbajal	Guthrie	Moolenaar
Cárdenas	Haaland	Moore
Carson (IN)	Hagedorn	Morelle
Carter (TX)	Harder (CA)	Moulton
Cartwright	Hartzer	Mucarsel-Powell
Case	Hastings	Mullin
Casten (IL)	Hayes	Murphy
Castor (FL)	Heck	Nadler
Castro (TX)	Herrera Beutler	Napolitano
Chabot	Higgins (LA)	Neal
Cheney	Higgins (NY)	Neguse
Chu, Judy	Hill (AR)	Newhouse
Cisneros	Hill (CA)	Norcross
Clark (MA)	Himes	Norton
Clarke (NY)	Holding	Nunes
Clay	Hollingsworth	O'Halleran
Cleaver	Horn, Kendra S.	Ocasio-Cortez
Cloud	Horsford	Omar
Clyburn	Houlahan	Palazzo
Cohen	Hoyer	Pallone
Cole	Hudson	Panetta
Collins (GA)	Huffman	Pappas
Collins (NY)	Huizenga	Pascarell
Comer	Hurd (TX)	Payne
Connolly	Jackson Lee	Pence
Cook	Jayapal	Perlmutter
Correa	Jeffries	Perry
Costa	Johnson (GA)	Peters
Courtney	Johnson (OH)	Peterson
Cox (CA)	Johnson (TX)	Phillips
Craig	Joyce (OH)	Pingree
Crawford	Kaptur	Plaskett
Crist	Katko	Pocan
Crow	Keating	Porter
Cuellar	Kelly (IL)	Pressley
Cummings	Kelly (PA)	Price (NC)
Cunningham	Kennedy	Quigley
Curtis	Khanna	Raskin
Davids (KS)	Kildee	Reed
Davidson (OH)	Kilmer	Reschenthaler
Davis (CA)	Kim	Richmond
Davis, Danny K.	Kind	Riggleman
Dean	King (IA)	Roby
DeFazio	King (NY)	Rodgers (WA)
DeGette	Kinziger	Roe, David P.
DeLauro	Kirkpatrick	Rogers (AL)
DelBene	Krishnamoorthi	Rogers (KY)
Delgado	Kuster (NH)	Rose (NY)
Demings	Kustoff (TN)	Rose, John W.
DeSaulnier	LaHood	Rouda
Deutch	Lamb	Rouzer
Diaz-Balart	Langevin	Roybal-Allard
Dingell	Larsen (WA)	Ruiz
Doggett	Larson (CT)	Ruppersberger
Doyle, Michael	Latta	Rush
F.	Lawrence	Sablan
Duffy	Lawson (FL)	San Nicolas
Dunn	Lee (CA)	Sarbanes
Engel	Lee (NV)	Scalise
Escobar	Levin (CA)	Scanlon

Schakowsky	Stanton	Upton
Schiff	Stauber	Van Drew
Schneider	Stefanik	Vargas
Schrader	Stell	Veasey
Schrier	Stevens	Vela
Scott (VA)	Stewart	Velázquez
Scott, Austin	Stivers	Vislosky
Scott, David	Suozzi	Wagner
Sensenbrenner	Swalwell (CA)	Walberg
Serrano	Takano	Walden
Sewell (AL)	Taylor	Walorski
Shalala	Thompson (CA)	Waltz
Sherman	Thompson (MS)	Wasserman
Sherrill	Thompson (PA)	Schultz
Shimkus	Thornberry	Waters
Simpson	Timmons	Watkins
Sires	Tipton	Watson Coleman
Slotkin	Titus	Wenstrup
Smith (MO)	Tlaib	Westerman
Smith (NE)	Tonko	Wexton
Smith (NJ)	Torres (CA)	Wild
Smith (WA)	Torres Small	Wilson (FL)
Smucker	(NM)	Wilson (SC)
Soto	Trahan	Wittman
Spanberger	Trone	Womack
Spano	Turner	Yarmuth
Speier	Underwood	Young

NOES—60

Allen	Fulcher	Marshall
Amash	Gaetz	Massie
Banks	Gohmert	Meuser
Bergman	Gooden	Mooney (WV)
Biggs	Gosar	Norman
Bishop (UT)	Graves (GA)	Palmer
Brooks (AL)	Guest	Posey
Buck	Harris	Ratcliffe
Budd	Hern, Kevin	Rice (SC)
Burchett	Hice (GA)	Roy
Carter (GA)	Hunter	Rutherford
Cline	Johnson (LA)	Schweikert
Conaway	Johnson (SD)	Steube
Crenshaw	Jordan	Walker
Davis, Rodney	Joyce (PA)	Webster (FL)
DesJarlais	Kelly (MS)	Williams
Duncan	LaMalfa	Woodall
Emmer	Lamborn	Wright
Ferguson	Lesko	Yoho
Fleischmann	Marchant	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—14

Abraham	McEachin	Ryan
Amodei	Olson	Sánchez
Babin	Radewagen	Weber (TX)
Cicilline	Rice (NY)	Welch
Cooper	Rooney (FL)	

□ 1055

Messrs. BROOKS of Alabama, FER-GUSON, and RICE of South Carolina changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. WENSTRUP, WESTERMAN, SCALISE, WATKINS, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Messrs. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and BARR changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. WEXTON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. WEXTON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 376, noes 46, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 164]

AYES—376

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Allred
Amash
Armstrong
Arrington
Axne
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady
Brindisi
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cloud
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Connolly
Cook
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davidson (OH)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett

Doyle, Michael F.
Duffy
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espallat
Evans
Ferguson
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy (NC)
Frankel
Fudge
Fulcher
Gabbard
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gianforte
Gibbs
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)
González-Colón (PR)
Gooden
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Guest
Guthrie
Haaland
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Hartzler
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill (AR)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi

Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Luria
Sherrill
Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marshall
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCarthy
McCauley
McClintock
McCollum
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Mullin
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Norcross
Norton
Nunes
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pannetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Richmond
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)

Rogers (KY)
Rose (NY)
Rose, John W.
Rouda
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Shimkus
Simpson
Torres (CA)
Torres Small
(NM)

Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spano
Speier
Stanton
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Stevens
Stewart
Stivers
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small
(NM)

Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watkins
Watson Coleman
Wenstrup
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Young
Zeldin

NOES—46

Banks
Barr
Biggs
Bishop (UT)
Brooks (AL)
Buck
Budd
Burchett
Chabot
Cline
Conaway
DesJarlais
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes

Gaetz
Gohmert
Gosar
Graves (GA)
Grothman
Harris
Hern, Kevin
Jordan
Kelly (MS)
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Massie
Mast
McHenry

Mooney (WV)
Norman
Posey
Rice (SC)
Roy
Rutherford
Schweikert
Steube
Walker
Webster (FL)
Westerman
Williams
Wright
Yoho

NOT VOTING—15

Abraham
Amodei
Babin
Cooper
Langevin

McEachin
Olson
Radewagen
Rice (NY)
Rooney (FL)

Ryan
Sánchez
Weber (TX)
Welch
Yarmuth

□ 1102

Mr. FERGUSON changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 164.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. MCADAMS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MCADAMS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 423, noes 0, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 165]

AYES—423

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Allred
Amash
Armstrong
Arrington
Axne
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady
Brindisi
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cloud
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davidson (OH)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio

DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett

DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espallat
Estes
Evans
Ferguson
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy (NC)
Frankel
Fudge
Fulcher
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)
González-Colón (PR)
Gooden
Gosar
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Haaland
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Harris
Hartzer
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill (AR)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hunter
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)

Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi

Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Luria
Sherrill
Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marshall
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCarthy
McCauley
McClintock
McCollum
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Mullin
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Norcross
Norton
Nunes

O'Halleran	Sablan	Thornberry
Ocasio-Cortez	San Nicolas	Timmons
Omar	Sarbanes	Tipton
Palazzo	Scalise	Titus
Pallone	Scanlon	Tlaib
Palmer	Schakowsky	Tonko
Panetta	Schiff	Torres (CA)
Pappas	Schneider	Torres Small
Pascrell	Schrader	(NM)
Payne	Schrier	Trahan
Pence	Schweikert	Trone
Perlmutter	Scott (VA)	Turner
Perry	Scott, Austin	Underwood
Peters	Scott, David	Upton
Peterson	Sensenbrenner	Van Drew
Phillips	Serrano	Vargas
Pingree	Sewell (AL)	Veasey
Plaskett	Shalala	Vela
Pocan	Sherman	Velázquez
Porter	Sherrill	Visclosky
Posey	Shinkus	Wagner
Pressley	Simpson	Walberg
Price (NC)	Sires	Walden
Quigley	Slotkin	Walker
Raskin	Smith (MO)	Walorski
Ratcliffe	Smith (NE)	Waltz
Reed	Smith (NJ)	Wasserman
Reschenthaler	Smith (WA)	Schultz
Rice (SC)	Smucker	Waters
Richmond	Soto	Watkins
Riggleman	Spanberger	Watson Coleman
Roby	Spano	Webster (FL)
Rodgers (WA)	Speier	Wenstrup
Roe, David P.	Stauber	Westerman
Rogers (AL)	Stefanik	Wexton
Rogers (KY)	Steil	Wild
Rose (NY)	Steube	Williams
Rose, John W.	Stevens	Wilson (FL)
Rouda	Stewart	Wilson (SC)
Rouzer	Stivers	Wittman
Roy	Suozzi	Womack
Roybal-Allard	Swalwell (CA)	Woodall
Ruiz	Takano	Wright
Ruppersberger	Taylor	Yarmuth
Rush	Thompson (CA)	Yoho
Rutherford	Thompson (MS)	Young
Ryan	Thompson (PA)	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—14

Abraham	McEachin	Sánchez
Amodel	Olson	Stanton
Babin	Radewagen	Weber (TX)
Bishop (UT)	Rice (NY)	Welch
Hurd (TX)	Rooney (FL)	

□ 1110

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. ESCOBAR). The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. NEGUSE) having assumed the chair, Ms. ESCOBAR, Acting Chair 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. 1644) to restore the open internet order of the Federal Communications Commission, and, pursuant to House Resolution 294, she reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

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.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit and it is at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. WALDEN. Oh, my gosh, Mr. Speaker, in its current form, yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Walden moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1644 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 4. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION REGARDING INTERNET TAX FREEDOM ACT.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to modify, impair, supersede, or authorize the modification, impairment, or supersession of the Internet Tax Freedom Act (47 U.S.C. 151 note).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

□ 1115

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, this amendment is actually pretty simple, and Members have a clear choice today on the floor: Are you for taxing the internet or not? That is the question.

As we have discussed at the Energy and Commerce Committee and again on the House floor today, Mr. Speaker, no one fully understands the implications of the underlying legislation. In fact, we have adopted amendments that the sponsor indicates aren't really necessary but do reinforce what is already in the bill. The scope of what it entails is still unclear, however, and the impact it could have on consumers is still uncertain.

Now, Democrats claim their bill permanently forbears from many of the heavy-handed regulations that the Federal Communications Commission could impose through this government takeover of the internet. It is important to note that nothing in the underlying bill would prevent the Federal Communications Commission from imposing similar regulations in the future or through other provisions in statute.

Now, my colleagues never could produce the list of 700 forbearances they claim the FCC engaged in that they are going to lock in statute today. That is what you are voting on, among other things. We never could get that list of 700 forbearances.

We have offered amendments in the committee and in the Rules Committee to ensure that consumers are protected and to ensure that the Democrats' rhetoric about their bill actually matches the substance. These amendments were all rejected on party-line votes in committee.

What is clear is that the Democrats want a government takeover of the internet. They want to open up the floodgates to a Federal, State, and local cash grab through taxation and fees that could be put on by local governments, State governments, and even the Federal Government.

Now, they will argue: Oh, no, there is nothing in the underlying bill, no, no, no. It does not touch the Internet Tax Freedom Act.

That might be true. It doesn't have to because the underlying bill opens the floodgates to section 201 and section 202 and other provisions that would allow local, State, and Federal governments to tax the internet. They can't do that today.

So, again, your vote is pretty simple: tax the internet or don't tax the internet.

Once you classify internet services under the utility-style services, tax administrators are going to do what they do best, and that is find a way to charge fees and taxes on this category since they understand how to get milk from every cow that walks by. Guess who is getting milked. It is the consumers.

So if you have any doubt, Mr. Speaker, just check your monthly phone bill. Your internet subscription is the new target. We are seeing all kinds of things in this bill. They are doubling, potentially, use of fees for the use of some facilities and poles, even altruistic-sounding ones on telecommunications relay services and 911.

But guess what. Just ask New York residents how much of their monthly 911 charges are being diverted from their 911 call centers. According to the Federal Communications Commission's 10th annual report to Congress on how States collect and use 911 fees, a staggering 90.35 percent of the money New Yorkers pay for 911 services gets diverted. For my friends in New Jersey, 77.26 percent gets diverted.

So these tax collectors know how to tax; they just haven't had the opportunity to tax the internet, but they may well get it under this bill if it were to become law.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is pretty simple. Republicans want to close the door on taxation of the internet. Will Democrats join us or not?

If you vote for the motion to recommit, Mr. Speaker, you vote to close the tax and freedom door. A "no" vote leaves that door wide open for taxation of the internet.

Do you want your consumers to pay higher bills every month for their internet service or not?

Say "no" to higher taxes and fees and "yes" to this amendment to protect those who actually pay the bill.

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

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, colleagues, pay close attention this. This proposal is completely unnecessary. Let me tell you why.

The bill simply restores the 2015 Open Internet Order that the FCC adopted and was upheld by the courts. Nothing in that order could or did give the FCC the authority to modify, impair, or supersede Federal law. To the contrary, the order said specifically that it did not impose new taxes or impact the Internet Tax Freedom Act.

The Internet Tax Freedom Act is Federal law. Nothing in this order allows the FCC to modify, impair, or supersede Federal law.

This is a complete nonissue, nothing you need to be worried about; and, frankly, it is just a last-ditch effort to delay and confuse people on net neutrality.

Now, let's get down to what this bill really does. What this bill does, basically, is three things:

First, the three we all agree on: no blocking, no throttling, and no paid prioritization. Republicans and Democrats say we all agree with that.

But, colleagues, that is not the end of the ball game, because we have already seen discriminatory practices by ISPs that aren't covered by blocking, throttling, and paid prioritization.

What my friends over here are saying is, sure, the three things we caught them red-handed on that they have already pled guilty to, we are not going to allow that anymore, but any new discriminatory behavior, any new unjust or unreasonable behavior, we don't want a cop on the beat to police that. We don't want to be able to give consumers the right to go to the FCC and get relief from that. It is like locking the front door and leaving the backdoor wide open.

Now, let's talk about another thing, too.

Two years ago, the Trump FCC repealed the Open Internet Order. What did it replace it with? Nothing. Nada. Zip. Crickets. They did nothing. It is the Wild, Wild West. Let the ISPs do anything they want and consumers be damned. That is what they did.

For 2 years, they could have brought their so-called version of light-touch net neutrality to the body. They controlled the House. They controlled the Senate. They got a Republican President. They did nothing because they don't believe in net neutrality, and they don't believe in protecting consumers.

Well, I have got news for my friends on this side of the aisle: You are not in charge here anymore. This is a new day. We didn't come to Washington, D.C., to represent companies. We came here to represent the American people.

May I tell my colleagues, whether they are Republicans, Democrats, or Independents, 86 percent of the American people say they want these rules restored.

Colleagues, this is your first and only chance to tell the American people

where you stand on net neutrality and whether you believe that the FCC should protect consumers. This is your chance to be on the right side of history, on the side of the angels, and on the side of the American people.

Let's defeat this motion to recommit and pass this bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 204, noes 216, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 166]

AYES—204

Aderholt	Duncan	Katko
Allen	Dunn	Kelly (MS)
Amash	Emmer	Kelly (PA)
Armstrong	Estes	King (IA)
Arrington	Ferguson	King (NY)
Axne	Fitzpatrick	Kinzinger
Bacon	Fleischmann	Kustoff (TN)
Baird	Flores	LaHood
Balderson	Fortenberry	LaMalfa
Banks	Foxx (NC)	Lamborn
Barr	Fulcher	Latta
Bergman	Gaetz	Lesko
Biggs	Gallagher	Long
Bilirakis	Gianforte	Loudermilk
Bishop (UT)	Gibbs	Lucas
Bost	Gohmert	Luetkemeyer
Brady	Golden	Marchant
Brindisi	Gonzalez (OH)	Marshall
Brooks (AL)	Gooden	Massie
Brooks (IN)	Gosar	Mast
Buchanan	Gottheimer	McCarthy
Buck	Granger	McCaul
Bucshon	Graves (GA)	McClintock
Budd	Graves (LA)	McHenry
Burchett	Graves (MO)	McKinley
Burgess	Green (TN)	Meadows
Byrne	Griffith	Meuser
Calvert	Grothman	Miller
Carter (GA)	Guest	Mitchell
Carter (TX)	Guthrie	Moolenaar
Chabot	Hagedorn	Mooney (WV)
Cheney	Harris	Mullin
Cline	Hartzler	Newhouse
Cloud	Hern, Kevin	Norman
Cole	Herrera Beutler	Nunes
Collins (GA)	Hice (GA)	Palazzo
Collins (NY)	Higgins (LA)	Palmer
Comer	Hill (AR)	Pence
Conaway	Holding	Perry
Cook	Hollingsworth	Posey
Craig	Horn, Kendra S.	Ratcliffe
Crawford	Hudson	Reed
Crenshaw	Huizenga	Reschenthaler
Cunningham	Hunter	Rice (SC)
Curtis	Hurd (TX)	Riggleman
Davidson (OH)	Johnson (LA)	Roby
Davis, Rodney	Johnson (OH)	Rodgers (WA)
Delgado	Johnson (SD)	Roe, David P.
DesJarlais	Jordan	Rogers (AL)
Diaz-Balart	Joyce (OH)	Rogers (KY)
Duffy	Joyce (PA)	Rose, John W.

Rouzer	Spano
Roy	Stauber
Rutherford	Stefanik
Scalise	Stell
Schrader	Steube
Schweikert	Stewart
Scott, Austin	Stivers
Sensenbrenner	Taylor
Sherrill	Thompson (PA)
Shimkus	Thornberry
Simpson	Timmons
Slotkin	Tipton
Smith (MO)	Turner
Smith (NE)	Upton
Smith (NJ)	Van Drew
Smucker	Wagner
Spanberger	Walberg

NOES—216

Adams	Garcia (TX)	Norcross
Aguilar	Gomez	O'Halleran
Allred	Gonzalez (TX)	Ocasio-Cortez
Barragán	Green (TX)	Omar
Bass	Grijalva	Pallone
Beatty	Haaland	Panetta
Bera	Harder (CA)	Pappas
Beyer	Hastings	Pascarell
Bishop (GA)	Hayes	Payne
Blumenauer	Heck	Perlmutter
Blunt Rochester	Higgins (NY)	Peters
Bonamici	Hill (CA)	Peterson
Boyle, Brendan F.	Himes	Phillips
Brown (MD)	Horsford	Pingree
Brownley (CA)	Houlahan	Pocan
Bustos	Hoyer	Porter
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Pressley
Carbajal	Jayapal	Price (NC)
Cárdenas	Jeffries	Quigley
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Raskin
Cartwright	Johnson (TX)	Richmond
Case	Kaptur	Rose (NY)
Casten (IL)	Keating	Rouda
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	Ruiz
Chu, Judy	Khanna	Ruppersberger
Cicilline	Kildee	Rush
Cisneros	Kilmer	Ryan
Clark (MA)	Kim	Sarbanes
Clarke (NY)	Kind	Scanlon
Clay	Kirkpatrick	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Krishnamoorthi	Schiff
Clyburn	Kuster (NH)	Schneider
Cohen	Lamb	Schrier
Connolly	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Cooper	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Correa	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Costa	Lawrence	Sewell (AL)
Courtney	Lawson (FL)	Shalala
Cox (CA)	Lee (CA)	Sherman
Crist	Lee (NV)	Sires
Crow	Levin (CA)	Smith (WA)
Cuellar	Levin (MI)	Soto
Cummings	Lewis	Speier
Davids (KS)	Lieu, Ted	Stanton
Davis (CA)	Lipinski	Stevens
Davis, Danny K.	Loeb sack	Suozzi
Dean	Lofgren	Swalwell (CA)
DeFazio	Lowenthal	Takano
DeGette	Lowe y	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	Lujan	Thompson (MS)
DeBene	Luria	Titus
Demings	Lynch	Tlaib
DeSaulnier	Malinowski	Tonko
Deutch	Maloney	Torres (CA)
Dingell	Carolyn B. Maloney	Torres Small (NM)
Doggett	Maloney, Sean	Trahan
Doyle, Michael F.	Matsui	Trone
Engel	McAdams	Underwood
Escobar	McBath	Vargas
Eshoo	McCollum	Veasey
Espallat	McGovern	Vela
Evans	McNerney	Velázquez
Finkenauer	Meeks	Visclosky
Fletcher	Meng	Wasserman
Foster	Moore	Schultz
Frankel	Morelle	Waters
Fudge	Moulton	Watson Coleman
Gabbard	Mucarsel-Powell	Wexton
Gallo	Murphy	Wild
Garamendi	Nadler	Wilson (FL)
Garcia (IL)	Napolitano	Yarmuth
	Neal	
	Neguse	

NOT VOTING—11

Abraham	McEachin	Sánchez
Amodeli	Olson	Weber (TX)
Babin	Rice (NY)	Welch
Huffman	Rooney (FL)	

□ 1130

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 190, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 167]

YEAS—232

Adams	Foster	McGovern
Aguilar	Frankel	McNerney
Allred	Fudge	Meeks
Axne	Gabbard	Meng
Barragán	Galleo	Moore
Bass	Garamendi	Morelle
Beatty	Garcia (IL)	Moulton
Bera	Garcia (TX)	Mucarsel-Powell
Beyer	Golden	Murphy
Bishop (GA)	Gomez	Nadler
Blumenauer	Gonzalez (TX)	Napolitano
Blunt Rochester	Gottheimer	Neal
Bonamici	Green (TX)	Neguse
Boyle, Brendan F.	Grijalva	Norcross
Brindisi	Haaland	O'Halleran
Brown (MD)	Harder (CA)	Ocasio-Cortez
Brownley (CA)	Hastings	Omar
Bustos	Hayes	Pallone
Butterfield	Heck	Panetta
Carbajal	Higgins (NY)	Pappas
Cárdenas	Hill (CA)	Pascarell
Carson (IN)	Himes	Payne
Cartwright	Horn, Kendra S.	Pelosi
Case	Horsford	Perlmutter
Casten (IL)	Houlihan	Peters
Castor (FL)	Hoyer	Peterson
Castro (TX)	Huffman	Phillips
Chu, Judy	Jackson Lee	Pingree
Cicilline	Jayapal	Pocan
Cisneros	Jeffries	Porter
Clark (MA)	Johnson (GA)	Posey
Clarke (NY)	Johnson (TX)	Pressley
Clay	Kaptur	Price (NC)
Cleaver	Keating	Quigley
Clyburn	Kelly (IL)	Raskin
Cohen	Kennedy	Richmond
Connolly	Khanna	Rose (NY)
Cooper	Kildee	Rouda
Correa	Kilmer	Roybal-Allard
Costa	Kim	Ruiz
Courtney	Kind	Ruppersberger
Cox (CA)	Kirkpatrick	Rush
Craig	Krishnamoorthi	Ryan
Crist	Kuster (NH)	Sarbanes
Crow	Lamb	Scanlon
Cuellar	Langevin	Schakowsky
Cummings	Larsen (WA)	Schiff
Cunningham	Larson (CT)	Schneider
Davids (KS)	Lawrence	Schrader
Davis (CA)	Lawson (FL)	Schrier
Davis, Danny K.	Lee (CA)	Scott (VA)
Dean	Lee (NV)	Scott, David
DeFazio	Levin (CA)	Serrano
DeGette	Levin (MI)	Sewell (AL)
DeLauro	Lewis	Shalala
DelBene	Lieu, Ted	Sherman
Delgado	Lipinski	Sherrill
Demings	Loeb sack	Sires
DeSaulnier	Lofgren	Slotkin
Deutch	Lowenthal	Smith (WA)
Dingell	Lowe y	Soto
Doggett	Lujan	Spanberger
Doyle, Michael F.	Luria	Speier
Engel	Lynch	Stanton
Escobar	Malinowski	Stevens
Eshoo	Maloney	Suozzi
Espallat	Maloney, Sean	Swalwell (CA)
Evans	Matsui	Takano
Finkenauer	McAdams	Thompson (CA)
Fletcher	McBath	Thompson (MS)
	McCollum	Titus
		Tlaib

Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small
(NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Van Drew

Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters

Watson Coleman
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—190

Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Armstrong
Arrington
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Fox (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden

NOT VOTING—10

Abraham
Amodei
Babin
McEachin

Olson
Rice (NY)
Rooney (FL)
Sanchez

Nunes
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spano
Staubert
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

□ 1144

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:

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Miss RICE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I regrettably missed the following vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 167.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, due to a family emergency, I was unable to vote on Roll Call

157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, and 167. I would include in the RECORD how I would have voted on each had I been present.

rollcall 157: "Aye", rollcall 158: "Aye", rollcall 159: "Aye", rollcall 160: "Aye", rollcall 161: "Aye", rollcall 162: "Aye", rollcall 163: "Aye", rollcall 164: "Aye", rollcall 165: "Aye", rollcall 166: "Nay", and rollcall 167: "Aye".

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Brian Pate, one of his secretaries.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 962, BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 962, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I urge the Speaker to immediately schedule this important bill to save the lives of these babies who are born alive after an abortion attempt. This bill is exceedingly important and should be brought to the floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not recognized for debate.

ADJOURNMENT FROM WEDNESDAY, APRIL 10, 2019, TO FRIDAY, APRIL 12, 2019

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2:30 p.m. on Friday, April 12, 2019.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ESPAILLAT). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

THE TRUMP ADMINISTRATION'S ATTACKS ON THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

(Ms. GARCIA of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn the Trump administration's new attacks on the Affordable Care Act.

Over 4.5 million non-elderly Texans have preexisting conditions that could keep them from getting insurance if the administration gets its wishes in Federal court. This is truly outrageous.