

(A) means any entity that receives disaster assistance directly from the Federal Government (including disaster assistance received through grant, loan, or contract) other than an individual; and

(B) includes a State that receives disaster assistance.

(4) SPECIFIED NATURAL DISASTER.—The term “specified natural disaster” means—

(A) a fire on public or private forest land or grassland described in section 420 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5187);

(B) a major disaster declared by the President under section 401 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 5170);

(C) an emergency declared by the President under section 501 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 5191); and

(D) any other natural disaster for which a disaster declaration is made by the Federal Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1307.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1307, the Post-Disaster Assistance Online Accountability Act, introduced by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS).

When a major disaster strikes, the American people should know how and where their disaster funds are spent without wading through reams of inscrutable government paperwork.

H.R. 1307 would simplify the data collection process for Federal disaster recovery projects and activities by establishing an online repository to which agencies could submit information on projects and spending.

In order to increase transparency to the public, the bill would also create a page on USASpending.gov for the public to track agency disaster recovery activities and the amount of assistance expended, on a quarterly basis.

□ 1415

Federal agencies need to be accountable to the victims of disasters so that they can have peace of mind when they are at their most vulnerable.

I strongly support the bill, and I urge my colleagues to join me.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 1307, the Post-Disaster Assistance Online Accountability Act, is going to improve our

oversight of Federal disaster assistance and projects.

By increasing the accountability and transparency in Federal spending following disasters, this bill is going to help ensure that funds are invested more wisely and better able to help Americans who are trying to recover and rebuild their lives.

H.R. 1307 is going to require various agencies that offer disaster assistance to publicly report data on disaster spending and obligations. It is critical, as we continue to work to reform and improve our disaster response and recovery programs, that we have the most accurate data available. That is important for our oversight, as well as for the taxpayers in holding agencies accountable.

I want to thank the Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management Subcommittee Ranking Member, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. PETERS, for their work on this legislation. I encourage my colleagues to support it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER).

Mr. ROUZER. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their support and work on this bill as well.

I certainly rise today in support of this measure sponsored and introduced by my friend and colleague, Mr. MEADOWS, also from North Carolina. We know firsthand just how badly this legislation is needed.

In my district alone, which has been a victim of two major hurricanes in the last 3 years, Matthew in 2016, and Florence just this past fall, after both hurricanes, Congress appropriated disaster aid funding for rebuilding and recovery efforts. To date, very little of that money, quite honestly, has been channeled to the State.

Taxpayers in North Carolina and across the rest of the country deserve to know how the Federal Government is spending these recovery funds, or whether they are being spent at all.

More transparency means more accountability and making this disaster funding data available online to the public will help ensure that these dollars that Congress has appropriated are being spent in a timely and effective manner.

As we continue to recover from Hurricanes Matthew and Florence, and prepare for yet another hurricane season this year, it is more important than ever that we make sure we are getting the most out of every single dollar that Congress appropriates. This bill will go a long way in helping to ensure just that.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As has been demonstrated by the last four bills, the Transportation Committee is doing good work, and we produced four good, bipartisan bills. I am very proud of that.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1307, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I want to thank the gentleman from Missouri. He has been a great partner in these and other ongoing efforts by the committee.

I urge the positive adoption of this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Mr. Speaker, I rise as a cosponsor to H.R. 1307—the Post-Disaster Assistance Online Accountability Act, which establishes a centralized location where Federal Agencies will publish information on disaster assistance.

This legislation requires reports every 3 months, that are available to the public regarding the total amount of assistance provided by agencies, the amount of funding that obligated, and where the funds are going, including all projects or activities that received funding.

To date, roughly 32 percent, or \$13.6 billion, of all funding, \$42 billion dollars, Congress has appropriated to Puerto Rico has actually been received by the communities and families who are trying to rebuild their lives on the island.

With this legislation my constituents will know exactly how much funding is still expected to come to Puerto Rico and to their communities. They will be able to see the process that agencies are making for timely dispersals of funding and holding them accountable.

Again, I want to thank Rep. PETERS and Ranking Member MEADOWS again for their work on this Disaster recovery related bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1307.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Lasky, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2249. An act to allow the Deputy Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration on the date of enactment of this Act to continue to serve as such Deputy Administrator.

STOPPING BAD ROBOCALLS ACT

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the

bill (H.R. 3375) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify the prohibitions on making robocalls, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3375

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Stopping Bad Robocalls Act”.

SEC. 2. CONSUMER PROTECTION REGULATIONS RELATING TO MAKING ROBOCALLS.

Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, and as appropriate thereafter to ensure that the consumer protection and privacy purposes of section 227 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227) remain effective, the Commission shall prescribe such regulations, or amend such existing regulations, regarding calls made or text messages sent using automatic telephone dialing systems and calls made using an artificial or prerecorded voice as will, in the judgment of the Commission, clarify descriptions of automatic telephone dialing systems and ensure that—

(1) the consumer protection and privacy purposes of such section are effectuated;

(2) calls made and text messages sent using automatic telephone dialing systems and calls made using an artificial or prerecorded voice are made or sent (as the case may be) with consent, unless consent is not required under or the call or text message is exempted by paragraph (1), (2)(B), or (2)(C) of subsection (b) of such section;

(3) consumers can withdraw consent for such calls and text messages;

(4) circumvention or evasion of such section is prevented;

(5) callers maintain records to demonstrate that such callers have obtained consent, unless consent is not required under or the call or text message is exempted by paragraph (1), (2)(B), or (2)(C) of subsection (b) of such section, for such calls and text messages, for a period of time that will permit the Commission to effectuate the consumer protection and privacy purposes of such section; and

(6) compliance with such section is facilitated.

SEC. 3. CONSUMER PROTECTIONS FOR EXEMPTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 227(b)(2) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (G)(ii), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in subparagraph (H), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(I) shall ensure that any exemption under subparagraph (B) or (C) contains requirements for calls made in reliance on the exemption with respect to—

“(i) the classes of parties that may make such calls;

“(ii) the classes of parties that may be called; and

“(iii) the number of such calls that a calling party may make to a particular called party.”.

(b) DEADLINE FOR REGULATIONS.—In the case of any exemption issued under subparagraph (B) or (C) of section 227(b)(2) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(b)(2)) before the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission, shall, not later than 1 year after such date of enactment, prescribe such regulations, or amend such existing regulations, as necessary to ensure that such exemption contains each require-

ment described in subparagraph (I) of such section, as added by subsection (a). To the extent such an exemption contains such a requirement before such date of enactment, nothing in this section or the amendments made by this section shall be construed to require the Commission to prescribe or amend regulations relating to such requirement.

SEC. 4. REPORT ON REASSIGNED NUMBER DATA-BASE.

(a) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit to Congress, and make publicly available on the website of the Commission, a report on the status of the efforts of the Commission pursuant to the Second Report and Order in the matter of Advanced Methods to Target and Eliminate Unlawful Robocalls (CG Docket No. 17-59; FCC 18-177; adopted on December 12, 2018).

(2) CONTENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall describe the efforts of the Commission, as described in such Second Report and Order, to ensure—

(A) the establishment of a database of telephone numbers that have been disconnected, in order to provide a person making calls subject to section 227(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(b)) with comprehensive and timely information to enable such person to avoid making calls without the prior express consent of the called party because the number called has been reassigned;

(B) that a person who wishes to use any safe harbor provided pursuant to such Second Report and Order with respect to making calls must demonstrate that, before making the call, the person appropriately checked the most recent update of the database and the database reported that the number had not been disconnected; and

(C) that if the person makes the demonstration described in subparagraph (B), the person will be shielded from liability under section 227(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(b)) should the database return an inaccurate result.

(b) CLARIFICATION OF DEFINITION OF CALLED PARTY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 227(a) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) The term ‘called party’ means, with respect to a call, the current subscriber or customary user of the telephone number to which the call is made, determined at the time when the call is made.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 227(d)(3)(B) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(d)(3)(B)) is amended—

(A) by striking “called party’s line” each place it appears and inserting “telephone line called”; and

(B) by striking “called party has hung up” and inserting “answering party has hung up”.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply beginning on the date on which the database described in the Second Report and Order in the matter of Advanced Methods to Target and Eliminate Unlawful Robocalls (CG Docket No. 17-59; FCC 18-177; adopted on December 12, 2018) becomes fully operational, such that a person may check the database to determine the last date of permanent disconnection associated with a phone number. Nothing in the amendments made by this subsection shall affect the construction of the law as it applies before the effective date.

SEC. 5. ENFORCEMENT.

(a) NO CITATION REQUIRED TO SEEK FORFEITURE PENALTY.—

(1) FOR ROBOCALL VIOLATIONS.—Section 227(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) NO CITATION REQUIRED TO SEEK FORFEITURE PENALTY.—Paragraph (5) of section 503(b) shall not apply in the case of a violation made with the intent to cause such violation of this subsection.”.

(2) FOR CALLER IDENTIFICATION INFORMATION VIOLATIONS.—Section 227(e)(5)(A)(iii) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(e)(5)(A)(iii)) is amended by adding at the end the following: “Paragraph (5) of section 503(b) shall not apply in the case of a violation of this subsection.”.

(b) 4-YEAR STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.—

(1) FOR ROBOCALL VIOLATIONS.—Section 227(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(b)), as amended by subsection (a), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) 4-YEAR STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.—Notwithstanding paragraph (6) of section 503(b), no forfeiture penalty for violation of this subsection shall be determined or imposed against any person if the violation charged occurred more than—

“(A) 3 years prior to the date of issuance of the notice required by paragraph (3) of such section or the notice of apparent liability required by paragraph (4) of such section (as the case may be); or

“(B) if the violation was made with the intent to cause such violation, 4 years prior to the date of issuance of the notice required by paragraph (3) of such section or the notice of apparent liability required by paragraph (4) of such section (as the case may be).”.

(2) FOR CALLER IDENTIFICATION INFORMATION VIOLATIONS.—Section 227(e)(5)(A)(iv) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(e)(5)(A)(iv)) is amended—

(A) in the heading, by striking “2-YEAR” and inserting “4-YEAR”; and

(B) by striking “2 years” and inserting “4 years”.

(c) INCREASED PENALTY FOR ROBOCALL VIOLATIONS WITH INTENT.—Section 227(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(b)), as amended by subsections (a) and (b), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) INCREASED PENALTY FOR VIOLATIONS WITH INTENT.—In the case of a forfeiture penalty for violation of this subsection that is determined or imposed under section 503(b), if such violation was made with the intent to cause such violation, the amount of such penalty shall be equal to an amount determined in accordance with subparagraphs (A) through (F) of section 503(b)(2) plus an additional penalty not to exceed \$10,000.”.

SEC. 6. ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS.

Section 227 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(i) ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS ON ROBOCALLS AND TRANSMISSION OF MISLEADING OR INACCURATE CALLER IDENTIFICATION INFORMATION.—

“(1) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this subsection, and annually thereafter, the Commission, after consultation with the Federal Trade Commission, shall submit to Congress a report regarding enforcement by the Commission of subsections (b), (c), (d), and (e) during the preceding calendar year.

“(2) MATTERS FOR INCLUSION.—Each report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

“(A) The number of complaints received by the Commission during each of the preceding five calendar years, for each of the following categories:

“(i) Complaints alleging that a consumer received a call in violation of subsection (b) or (c).

“(ii) Complaints alleging that a consumer received a call in violation of the standards prescribed under subsection (d).

“(iii) Complaints alleging that a consumer received a call in connection with which misleading or inaccurate caller identification information was transmitted in violation of subsection (e).

“(B) The number of citations issued by the Commission pursuant to section 503(b) during the preceding calendar year to enforce subsection (d), and details of each such citation.

“(C) The number of notices of apparent liability issued by the Commission pursuant to section 503(b) during the preceding calendar year to enforce subsections (b), (c), (d), and (e), and details of each such notice including any proposed forfeiture amount.

“(D) The number of final orders imposing forfeiture penalties issued pursuant to section 503(b) during the preceding calendar year to enforce such subsections, and details of each such order including the forfeiture imposed.

“(E) The amount of forfeiture penalties or criminal fines collected, during the preceding calendar year, by the Commission or the Attorney General for violations of such subsections, and details of each case in which such a forfeiture penalty or criminal fine was collected.

“(F) Proposals for reducing the number of calls made in violation of such subsections.

“(G) An analysis of the contribution by providers of interconnected VoIP service and non-interconnected VoIP service that discount high-volume, unlawful, short-duration calls to the total number of calls made in violation of such subsections, and recommendations on how to address such contribution in order to decrease the total number of calls made in violation of such subsections.

“(3) NO ADDITIONAL REPORTING REQUIRED.—The Commission shall prepare the report required by paragraph (1) without requiring the provision of additional information from providers of telecommunications service or voice service (as defined in section 7(d) of the Stopping Bad Robocalls Act).”

SEC. 7. REGULATIONS RELATING TO EFFECTIVE CALL AUTHENTICATION TECHNOLOGY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall prescribe regulations in WC Docket No. 17-97.

(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR EFFECTIVE CALL AUTHENTICATION TECHNOLOGY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The regulations required by subsection (a) shall—

(A) require providers of voice service to implement, within six months after the date on which such regulations are prescribed, an effective call authentication technology; and

(B) ensure that voice service providers that have implemented the effective authentication technology attest that such provider has determined, when originating calls on behalf of a calling party, that the calling party number transmitted with such calls has been appropriately authenticated.

(2) REASSESSMENT OF REGULATIONS.—The Commission shall reassess such regulations, at least once every two years, to ensure the regulations remain effective and up to date with technological capabilities.

(3) EXEMPTION.—

(A) BURDENS AND BARRIERS TO IMPLEMENTATION.—The Commission—

(i) shall include findings on any burdens or barriers to the implementation required in paragraph (1), including—

(I) for providers of voice service to the extent the networks of such providers use time-division multiplexing; and

(II) for small providers of voice service and those in rural areas; and

(ii) in connection with such findings, may exempt from the 6-month time period described in paragraph (1)(A), for a reasonable period of time a class of providers of voice service, or type of voice calls, as necessary for that class of providers or type of calls to participate in the implementation in order to address the identified burdens and barriers.

(B) FULL PARTICIPATION.—The Commission shall take all steps necessary to address any issues in the findings and enable as promptly as possible full participation of all classes of providers of voice service and types of voice calls to receive the highest level of attestation.

(C) ALTERNATIVE METHODOLOGIES.—The Commission shall identify or develop, in consultation with small providers of service and those in rural areas, alternative effective methodologies to protect customers from unauthenticated calls during any exemption given under subparagraph (A)(ii). Such methodologies shall be provided with no additional line item charge to customers.

(D) REVISION OF EXEMPTION.—Not less frequently than annually after the first exemption is issued under this paragraph, the Commission shall consider revising or extending any exemption made, may revise such exemption, and shall issue a public notice with regard to whether such exemption remains necessary.

(4) ACCURATE IDENTIFICATION.—The regulations required by subsection (a) shall include guidelines that providers of voice service may use as part of the implementation of effective call authentication technology under paragraph (1) to take steps to ensure the calling party is accurately identified.

(5) NO ADDITIONAL COST TO CONSUMERS OR SMALL BUSINESS CUSTOMERS.—The regulations required by subsection (a) shall prohibit providers of voice service from making any additional line item charges to consumer or small business customer subscribers for the effective call authentication technology required under paragraph (1).

(6) EVALUATION.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and consistent with the regulations prescribed under subsection (a), the Commission shall initiate an evaluation of the success of the effective call authentication technology required under paragraph (1).

(7) UNAUTHENTICATED CALLS.—The Commission shall—

(A) in the regulations required by subsection (a), consistent with the regulations prescribed under subsection (k) of section 227 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227), as added by section 8, help protect subscribers from receiving unwanted calls from a caller using an unauthenticated number, through effective means of enabling the subscriber or provider to block such calls, with no additional line item charge to the subscriber; and

(B) take appropriate steps to ensure that calls originating from a provider of service in an area where the provider is exempt from the 6-month time period described in paragraph (1)(A) are not wrongly blocked because the calls are not able to be authenticated.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 6 months after the date on which the regulations under subsection (a) are prescribed, the Commission 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, and make publicly available on its website, a

report on the implementation of subsection (b), which shall include—

(1) an analysis of the extent to which providers of a voice service have implemented the effective call authentication technology, including whether the availability of necessary equipment and equipment upgrades has impacted such implementation; and

(2) an assessment of the effective call authentication technology, as being implemented under subsection (b), in addressing all aspects of call authentication.

(d) VOICE SERVICE DEFINED.—In this section, the term “voice service”—

(1) means any service that is interconnected with the public switched telephone network and that furnishes voice communications to an end user using resources from the North American Numbering Plan or any successor to the North American Numbering Plan adopted by the Commission under section 251(e)(1) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 251(e)(1)); and

(2) includes—

(A) transmissions from a telephone facsimile machine, computer, or other device to a telephone facsimile machine; and

(B) without limitation, any service that enables real-time, two-way voice communications, including any service that requires internet protocol-compatible customer premises equipment (commonly known as “CPE”) and permits out-bound calling, whether or not the service is one-way or two-way voice over internet protocol.

SEC. 8. STOP ROBOCALLS.

(a) INFORMATION SHARING REGARDING ROBOCALL AND SPOOFING VIOLATIONS.—Section 227 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227), as amended by section 6, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

(j) INFORMATION SHARING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Commission shall prescribe regulations to establish a process that streamlines the ways in which a private entity may voluntarily share with the Commission information relating to—

“(A) a call made or a text message sent in violation of subsection (b); or

“(B) a call or text message for which misleading or inaccurate caller identification information was caused to be transmitted in violation of subsection (e).

“(2) TEXT MESSAGE DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘text message’ has the meaning given such term in subsection (e)(8).”

(b) ROBOCALL BLOCKING SERVICE.—Section 227 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227), as amended by section 6 and subsection (a) of this section, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

(k) ROBOCALL BLOCKING SERVICE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Commission shall take a final agency action to ensure the robocall blocking services provided on an opt-out or opt-in basis pursuant to the Declaratory Ruling of the Commission in the matter of Advanced Methods to Target and Eliminate Unlawful Robocalls (CG Docket No. 17-59; FCC 19-51; adopted on June 6, 2019)—

“(A) are provided with transparency and effective redress options for both—

“(i) consumers; and

“(ii) callers; and

“(B) are provided with no additional line item charge to consumers and no additional charge to callers for resolving complaints related to erroneously blocked calls.

“(2) TEXT MESSAGE DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘text message’ has the meaning given such term in subsection (e)(8).”

(C) STUDY ON INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN VOIP SERVICE PROVIDERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall conduct a study regarding whether to require a provider of covered VoIP service to—

(A) provide to the Commission contact information for such provider and keep such information current; and

(B) retain records relating to each call transmitted over the covered VoIP service of such provider that are sufficient to trace such call back to the source of such call.

(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit to Congress a report on the results of the study conducted under paragraph (1).

(3) COVERED VOIP SERVICE DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term “covered VoIP service” means a service that—

(A) is an interconnected VoIP service (as defined in section 3 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 153)); or

(B) would be an interconnected VoIP service (as so defined) except that the service permits users to terminate calls to the public switched telephone network but does not permit users to receive calls that originate on the public switched telephone network.

(d) TRANSITIONAL RULE REGARDING DEFINITION OF TEXT MESSAGE.—Paragraph (2) of subsection (j) of section 227 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227), as added by subsection (a) of this section, and paragraph (2) of subsection (k) of such section 227, as added by subsection (b) of this section, shall apply before the effective date of the amendment made to subsection (e)(8) of such section 227 by subparagraph (C) of section 503(a)(2) of division P of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018 (Public Law 115–141) as if such amendment was already in effect.

SEC. 9. PROVISION OF EVIDENCE OF CERTAIN ROBOCALL VIOLATIONS TO ATTORNEY GENERAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If the Chief of the Enforcement Bureau of the Commission obtains evidence that suggests a willful, knowing, and repeated robocall violation with an intent to defraud, cause harm, or wrongfully obtain anything of value, the Chief of the Enforcement Bureau shall provide such evidence to the Attorney General.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Commission shall publish on its website and 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) states the number of instances during the preceding year in which the Chief of the Enforcement Bureau provided the evidence described in subsection (a) to the Attorney General; and

(2) contains a general summary of the types of robocall violations to which such evidence relates.

(c) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect the ability of the Commission or the Chief of the Enforcement Bureau under other law—

(1) to refer a matter to the Attorney General; or

(2) to pursue or continue pursuit of an enforcement action in a matter with respect to which the Chief of the Enforcement Bureau provided the evidence described in subsection (a) to the Attorney General.

(d) ROBOCALL VIOLATION DEFINED.—In this section, the term “robocall violation” means a violation of subsection (b) or (e) of section 227 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227).

SEC. 10. PROTECTION FROM ONE-RING SCAMS.

(a) INITIATION OF PROCEEDING.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment

of this Act, the Commission shall initiate a proceeding to protect called parties from one-ring scams.

(b) MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED.—As part of the proceeding required by subsection (a), the Commission shall consider how the Commission can—

(1) work with Federal and State law enforcement agencies to address one-ring scams;

(2) work with the governments of foreign countries to address one-ring scams;

(3) in consultation with the Federal Trade Commission, better educate consumers about how to avoid one-ring scams;

(4) incentivize voice service providers to stop calls made to perpetrate one-ring scams from being received by called parties, including consideration of adding identified one-ring scam type numbers to the Commission’s existing list of permissible categories for carrier-initiated blocking;

(5) work with entities that provide call-blocking services to address one-ring scams; and

(6) establish obligations on international gateway providers that are the first point of entry for these calls into the United States, including potential requirements that such providers verify with the foreign originator the nature or purpose of calls before initiating service.

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall publish on its website and 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 on the status of the proceeding required by subsection (a).

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ONE-RING SCAM.—The term “one-ring scam” means a scam in which a caller makes a call and allows the call to ring the called party for a short duration, in order to prompt the called party to return the call, thereby subjecting the called party to charges.

(2) STATE.—The term “State” has the meaning given such term in section 3 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 153).

(3) VOICE SERVICE.—The term “voice service” has the meaning given such term in section 227(e)(8) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(e)(8)). This paragraph shall apply before the effective date of the amendment made to such section by subparagraph (C) of section 503(a)(2) of division P of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018 (Public Law 115–141) as if such amendment was already in effect.

SEC. 11. INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Commission, shall convene an interagency working group to study the enforcement of section 227(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(b)).

(b) DUTIES.—In carrying out the study under subsection (a), the interagency working group shall—

(1) determine whether, and if so how, any Federal law, including regulations, policies, and practices, or budgetary or jurisdictional constraints inhibit the enforcement of such section;

(2) identify existing and potential Federal policies and programs that encourage and improve coordination among Federal departments and agencies and States, and between States, in the enforcement and prevention of the violation of such section;

(3) identify existing and potential international policies and programs that encourage and improve coordination between countries in the enforcement and prevention of

the violation of such section (and laws of foreign countries prohibiting similar conduct); and

(4) consider—

(A) the benefit and potential sources of additional resources for the Federal enforcement and prevention of the violation of such section;

(B) whether memoranda of understanding regarding the enforcement and prevention of the violation of such section should be established between—

(i) the States;

(ii) the States and the Federal Government; and

(iii) the Federal Government and foreign governments;

(C) whether a process should be established to allow States to request Federal subpoenas from the Commission with respect to the enforcement of such section;

(D) whether increased criminal penalties for the violation of such section (including increasing the amount of fines and increasing the maximum term of imprisonment that may be imposed to a period greater than 2 years) are appropriate;

(E) whether regulation of any entity that enters into a business arrangement with a carrier for the specific purpose of carrying, routing, or transmitting a call that constitutes a violation of such section would assist in the successful enforcement and prevention of the violation of such section; and

(F) the extent to which the prosecution of certain violations of such section (which result in economic, physical, or emotional harm) pursuant to any Department of Justice policy may inhibit or otherwise interfere with the prosecution of other violations of such section.

(c) MEMBERS.—The interagency working group shall be composed of such representatives of Federal departments and agencies as the Attorney General considers appropriate, which may include—

(1) the Department of Commerce (including the National Telecommunications and Information Administration);

(2) the Department of State;

(3) the Department of Homeland Security;

(4) the Commission;

(5) the Federal Trade Commission; and

(6) the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.

(d) NON-FEDERAL STAKEHOLDERS.—In carrying out the study under subsection (a), the interagency working group shall consult with such non-Federal stakeholders as the Attorney General determines have relevant expertise, including the National Association of Attorneys General.

(e) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 9 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the interagency working group shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report on the findings of the study under subsection (a), including—

(1) any recommendations regarding the enforcement and prevention of the violation of such section; and

(2) a description of what process, if any, relevant Federal departments and agencies have made in implementing the recommendations under paragraph (1).

SEC. 12. COMMISSION DEFINED.

In this Act, the term “Commission” means the Federal Communications Commission.

SEC. 13. ANNUAL ROBOCALL REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Commission

shall make publicly available on the website of the Commission, and 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 on the status of private-led efforts to trace back the origin of suspected unlawful robocalls by the registered consortium and the participation of voice service providers in such efforts.

(b) CONTENTS OF REPORT.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include, at minimum, the following:

(1) A description of private-led efforts to trace back the origin of suspected unlawful robocalls by the registered consortium and the actions taken by the registered consortium to coordinate with the Commission.

(2) A list of voice service providers identified by the registered consortium that participated in private-led efforts to trace back the origin of suspected unlawful robocalls through the registered consortium.

(3) A list of each voice service provider that received a request from the registered consortium to participate in private-led efforts to trace back the origin of suspected unlawful robocalls and refused to participate, as identified by the registered consortium.

(4) The reason, if any, each voice service provider identified by the registered consortium provided for not participating in private-led efforts to trace back the origin of suspected unlawful robocalls.

(5) A description of how the Commission may use the information provided to the Commission by voice service providers or the registered consortium that have participated in private-led efforts to trace back the origin of suspected unlawful robocalls in the enforcement efforts by the Commission.

(c) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—Not later than 210 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Commission shall issue a notice to the public seeking additional information from voice service providers and the registered consortium of private-led efforts to trace back the origin of suspected unlawful robocalls necessary for the report by the Commission required under subsection (a).

(d) REGISTRATION OF CONSORTIUM OF PRIVATE-LED EFFORTS TO TRACE BACK THE ORIGIN OF SUSPECTED UNLAWFUL ROBOCALLS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall issue rules to establish a registration process for the registration of a single consortium that conducts private-led efforts to trace back the origin of suspected unlawful robocalls. The consortium shall meet the following requirements:

(A) Be a neutral third-party competent to manage the private-led effort to trace back the origin of suspected unlawful robocalls in the judgement of the Commission.

(B) Maintain a set of written best practices about the management of such efforts and regarding providers of voice services' participation in private-led efforts to trace back the origin of suspected unlawful robocalls.

(C) Consistent with section 222(d)(2) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 222(d)(2)), any private-led efforts to trace back the origin of suspected unlawful robocalls conducted by the third-party focus on "fraudulent, abusive, or unlawful" traffic.

(D) File a notice with the Commission that the consortium intends to conduct private-led efforts to trace back in advance of such registration.

(2) ANNUAL NOTICE BY THE COMMISSION SEEKING REGISTRATIONS.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Commission shall issue a notice to the public seeking the registration described in paragraph (1).

(e) LIST OF VOICE SERVICE PROVIDERS.—The Commission may publish a list of voice service providers and take appropriate enforcement action based on information obtained from the consortium about voice service providers that refuse to participate in private-led efforts to trace back the origin of suspected unlawful robocalls, and other information the Commission may collect about service providers that are found to originate or transmit substantial amounts of illegal calls.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) PRIVATE-LED EFFORT TO TRACE BACK.—The term "private-led effort to trace back" means an effort made by the registered consortium of voice service providers to establish a methodology for determining the origin of a suspected unlawful robocall.

(2) REGISTERED CONSORTIUM.—The term "registered consortium" means the consortium registered under subsection (d).

(3) SUSPECTED UNLAWFUL ROBOCALL.—The term "suspected unlawful robocall" means a call that the Commission or a voice service provider reasonably believes was made in violation of subsection (b) or (e) of section 227 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227).

(4) VOICE SERVICE.—The term "voice service"—

(A) means any service that is interconnected with the public switched telephone network and that furnishes voice communications to an end user using resources from the North American Numbering Plan or any successor to the North American Numbering Plan adopted by the Commission under section 251(e)(1) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 251(e)(1)); and

(B) includes—

(i) transmissions from a telephone facsimile machine, computer, or other device to a telephone facsimile machine; and

(ii) without limitation, any service that enables real-time, two-way voice communications, including any service that requires internet protocol-compatible customer premises equipment (commonly known as "CPE") and permits out-bound calling, whether or not the service is one-way or two-way voice over internet protocol.

SEC. 14. HOSPITAL ROBOCALL PROTECTION GROUP.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall establish an advisory committee to be known as the "Hospital Robocall Protection Group".

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The Group shall be composed only of the following members:

(1) An equal number of representatives from each of the following:

(A) Voice service providers that serve hospitals.

(B) Companies that focus on mitigating unlawful robocalls.

(C) Consumer advocacy organizations.

(D) Providers of one-way voice over internet protocol services described in subsection (e)(4)(B)(ii).

(E) Hospitals.

(F) State government officials focused on combatting unlawful robocalls.

(2) One representative of the Commission.

(3) One representative of the Federal Trade Commission.

(c) ISSUANCE OF BEST PRACTICES.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which the Group is established under subsection (a), the Group shall issue best practices regarding the following:

(1) How voice service providers can better combat unlawful robocalls made to hospitals.

(2) How hospitals can better protect themselves from such calls, including by using unlawful robocall mitigation techniques.

(3) How the Federal Government and State governments can help combat such calls.

(d) PROCEEDING BY FCC.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which the best practices are issued by the Group under subsection (c), the Commission shall conclude a proceeding to assess the extent to which the voluntary adoption of such best practices can be facilitated to protect hospitals and other institutions.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) GROUP.—The term "Group" means the Hospital Robocall Protection Group established under subsection (a).

(2) STATE.—The term "State" has the meaning given such term in section 3 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 153).

(3) VOICE SERVICE.—The term "voice service"—

(A) means any service that is interconnected with the public switched telephone network and that furnishes voice communications to an end user using resources from the North American Numbering Plan or any successor to the North American Numbering Plan adopted by the Commission under section 251(e)(1) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 251(e)(1)); and

(B) includes—

(i) transmissions from a telephone facsimile machine, computer, or other device to a telephone facsimile machine; and

(ii) without limitation, any service that enables real-time, two-way voice communications, including any service that requires internet protocol-compatible customer premises equipment (commonly known as "CPE") and permits out-bound calling, whether or not the service is one-way or two-way voice over internet protocol.

SEC. 15. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled "Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation" for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 3375.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3375, the Stopping Bad Robocalls Act, it is bipartisan legislation that I introduced with Ranking Member WALDEN, Communications and Technology Subcommittee Chairman DOYLE, and Subcommittee Ranking Member LATTA. This legislation advanced out of our Energy and Commerce Committee last week by a unanimous vote of 48-0.

The rising tide of unlawful, unwanted robocalls started as a nuisance, but now threatens the way consumers view and use their telephones. These calls are undermining our entire phone system, and that is something we all need to take very, very seriously.

Last year, there were an estimated 47 billion robocalls made to Americans. It is no wonder that the American people have lost confidence in answering their phones. The Stopping Bad Robocalls Act will help restore that confidence, and that is very important, in my opinion.

Madam Speaker, Americans use their phones at some of the most important times of their lives. They use their phones to get help from first responders by calling 911; to hear important medical test results from their doctor; to connect with or reassure a family member or friend; to learn that school is closed tomorrow; or just to conduct daily business.

Illegal, unwanted robocalls threaten the foundational ways that we communicate with one another and, that, in my opinion is dangerous.

Each time the consumer chooses not to pick up the phone out of fear that a scam robocall is on the other end of the line, it chips away at our community and public safety. Too frequently, consumers feel their best option is to not answer their ringing phone, which may lead them to miss an important call.

It is truly unfortunate that consumers feel they must take that risk in order to proactively defend themselves against a scam call. Some studies estimate that nearly half of all calls this year will be scam calls; and these calls are not only harmful to the American people, but they are also harmful to business.

The Chief Information Security Officer of the Moffitt Cancer Center recently testified before our committee that scammers were calling his hospital, disguised as Department of Justice officials, demanding to speak with a physician about his medical license. Robocalls are dangerous to public health and to people's privacy, using this as an example.

We have heard similar stories of scammers disguised as the IRS looking to collect a debt; scammers disguised as local governments or police departments; and scammers disguised as loved ones in trouble looking for help. We are even seeing new scams, such as the one-ring-scam, where fraudsters try to trick consumers into calling back international numbers in the hopes that the consumer will rack up large charges.

All of these scams are different, and there is no silver bullet to fix them all. For that reason, this legislation takes the comprehensive approach to cut off robocalls at many different points.

For example, the bill would implement a nationwide caller authentication system, free for consumers, so they can again trust that the number they see on their caller ID is actually the person calling them.

In that same vein, consumers need more help controlling the calls they have asked not to receive. Consumers need to be in charge of their own phone numbers, and scammers or telemarketers must have a consumer's consent before making calls.

Consumers should be able to block illegal and unwanted calls. But with blocking, there needs to be transparency and effective redress so that we ensure the calls people want are actually getting through.

Madam Speaker, we need to ensure that law enforcement and the Federal Communications Commission have the tools, information, and incentives to go after robocallers that break the law.

This bill takes all these steps and more. It also includes the text of many important proposals that would help address the onslaught of robocalls that consumers face.

And I just want to mention some of the other bills that were introduced that we have tried to incorporate in this bill. One is the Ending One-Ring Scams Act; the Tracing Back and Catching Unlawful Robocallers Act; the Locking Up Robocallers Act, the Spam Calls Task Force Act; and the Protecting Patients and Doctors from Unlawful Robocalls Act. I will thank the sponsors of those more specifically later during this debate.

But ours is a strong and comprehensive bill that puts consumers first. I want to thank all of my colleagues that have shaped this bill with me, specifically, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. LATTA, of course. But I also want to thank all the consumer advocacy organizations and the carriers that worked hard to reach a consensus piece of legislation that will take tough and meaningful steps to protect consumers from these annoying and illegal robocalls.

Madam Speaker, the legislation now has 237 sponsors, and I am hopeful that it will garner strong bipartisan support today when we vote.

I urge all of my colleagues to put consumers first and join us in passing the Stopping Bad Robocalls Act.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3375, the Stopping Bad Robocalls Act. I will speak more later of my contribution on this legislation, but I congratulate the authors of this legislation, both the majority and the minority.

The American Association of Retired Persons sent us a letter yesterday urging the adoption by stating: "All Americans will benefit from the provisions of H.R. 3375 that promote an accurate call authentication framework and prevent consumers from being charged for blocking technology."

The support does not end with them, but it spans the consumer and industry groups that have seen the impact of this. This bill incorporates the best of

the private sector solutions, at the same time putting the call out to crack down on these illegal actors for the criminals that they are.

We are going to shut these scammers down. This legislation establishes a more rigorous enforcement structure to shut down illegal robocalls. It empowers the Federal Communications Commission with additional enforcement. It also sets the path for providers to implement new caller ID technologies, with no new line-item charges to the consumers.

The fraud committed on Americans by illegal robocallers is going to stop. This bipartisan legislation creates a robust framework designed to protect consumers from the fraud and nuisance of these calls.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), the ranking member of the full committee.

Mr. WALDEN. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues for their work on the Stopping Bad Robocalls Act.

To Chairman PALLONE, to Chairman DOYLE, to Congressman LATTA, and everybody that has been involved in this, I think we have come to a really good agreement here, and it will help stop the illegal robocalls; hopefully, all 47.8 billion. Let that number sink in.

Last year, in America, 47.8 billion calls were made to all of us, and they were mostly all illegal, and we are going to do our best to stop them.

You will be hard-pressed to find a technology that is more personal than your phone; whether it is the phone you carry in your pocket or, for some, a landline at home, and how we communicate on these devices is essential in the way that we connect to one another.

Yet that personal connection is being violated by bad actors that have compromised our country's communications networks and who hide their tracks with their own hardware and software.

These criminal parties have done significant harm to Americans, both personally and professionally. Those that engage in such illicit behavior should be treated and prosecuted for what they are, criminals.

From the outset of our legislative effort to address this problem, I stated we must make a clear distinction between parties that have ill purpose, as opposed to those who do not. After all, we don't want to shut off legitimate uses of these new technologies, such as protecting the anonymity of a women's shelter assisting at-risk individuals or alerting you to a fraudulent use of your credit card or providing you the simple convenience of interacting with your ride-share service. Those are legitimate purposes.

Our clearest and quickest path for passing legislation, along with our friends in the Senate and, ultimately, to become law, is to go after those that have malicious intent; and to go beyond that could undermine services

Americans depend on every day. So I think we have found the right balance here.

□ 1430

By taking all this into account, we can achieve the same kind of bipartisan, bicameral success as exemplified by the RAY BAUM'S Act last Congress, which, notably, provided us with the launching pad for where we are today.

Now, that law provided the FCC with more authority to go after bad actors who utilize calls and texts. Our work from then was echoed by a broad bipartisan group of attorneys general from across the United States calling for the FCC to move on updating its own rules.

Now, we know communications and technologies are constantly evolving, and, unfortunately, the bad actors' tricks have evolved beyond our Do Not Call Registry, and I am sure they will continue figuring out a way to get around this effort. However, the more friction we can create against illicit behavior, the more focused public-private partnerships we can create among industry, consumer groups, and government that will help us root out this problem, prosecute these criminals to the fullest extent of the law, and make great strides in regaining Americans' confidence in their communication devices.

Now, in the 35 townhalls I have held in my district this year and phone calls I get to my office, people ask one question. I bet they ask it of you, Madam Speaker.

What are you going to do to stop these robocalls?

I will tell you what. This is a number you can answer, 3375. That is the number of the bill. Pick it up; answer it; vote "yes"; and we will put an end to these robocalls—at least for now.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO), who chairs our Health Subcommittee.

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I thank the chairman of the full committee; the ranking member, Mr. WALDEN; the ranking member of the subcommittee, Mr. LATTA; and the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. DOYLE, for bringing forward this bipartisan legislation.

I hope when the vote is taken on this today by the full House that it is unanimous. And if it is—and it should be—I think we are going to hear applause from across the country, because the American people have been bombarded by robocalls every day.

Last year, as has been stated, Americans received an unfathomable 48 billion—with a B—robocalls. So this is an epidemic, and anyone with a phone knows this.

I hear it from my constituents daily. I think we all do. I have been subjected to them. All of my colleagues have been subjected to them, and their families, as well.

And these calls are not only highly annoying; they are also used to scam

people and to swindle them. Last year, an estimated 43 million Americans were scammed out of \$10½ billion. That is a lot of money. And I have some friends, intelligent people, who were convinced by the story at the other end of the line.

So the American people, for all the legitimate reasons, are demanding that we do something, and today I think we are delivering a victory for them. I am certainly proud to cosponsor the legislation. And, as has been said, no one bill can completely solve a complex problem, so the FCC and Congress have to remain vigilant to ensure that the statutory and the regulatory protections are sufficient to protect the consumers.

There are heavy fees for violators in this bill, so it is really going to cost them, and it is not simply paying because it is a cost of doing business.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA), the ranking member of the Communications and Technology Subcommittee on the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. LATTA. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise today because robocalls have to stop. With the help of our phone carriers and the FCC, we have crafted solid legislation in the Stopping Bad Robocalls Act. But the most important voices heard in the crafting of this bill were the men and women from our districts who have had to deal with these calls.

Illegal robocalls are annoying, disruptive, and harmful. Sadly, Madam Speaker, for many people in Ohio and across the country, these calls have also ruined lives. I hosted a workshop geared toward helping seniors avoid becoming victims of scams, including illegal robocalls, and the stories are heartbreaking.

We heard from seniors who have been manipulated into giving away their life savings to scammers, often because they were tricked into thinking someone they loved had been hurt. They told me, if there was a way for them to know that it was an illegal robocall before they answered that call, this could have possibly been prevented.

That is one of the many solutions we offer in the Stopping Bad Robocalls Act. I am proud to have contributed with language from our own STOP Robocalls Act, which would make it easier for Americans to access robocall blocking technology through their phone companies on an informed opt-out basis.

Prior to this legislation and the FCC ruling, these services were available to consumers who opted in to receive them. This restriction made the number of customers using blocking technology very low. This legislation will change that.

Madam Speaker, Americans deserve peace of mind knowing that the phones

that connect us to the world are being used for good and not scams.

I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey, the chairman of the full committee; the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the chairman of the subcommittee; and the gentleman from Oregon, the Republican leader of the full committee for working with us on this legislation.

I also want to thank our great staffs for all the hard work that they did in making sure we got this legislation to the floor today.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3375.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE), who chairs our Communications and Technology Subcommittee.

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, today the House will vote on the Stopping Bad Robocalls Act, legislation introduced by Chairman PALLONE, Ranking Member WALDEN, Ranking Member LATTA, and me. This bill addresses a problem that we all have firsthand experience with: persistent, annoying, nonstop robocalls.

Americans received nearly 48 billion robocalls last year, a 60 percent increase from the year before. That number is expected to increase to 60 billion this year. In June alone, in my hometown of Pittsburgh, we received an estimated 34 million robocalls. On average, everyone in this country receives 14 of these calls every day.

This bill is a comprehensive, bipartisan solution that I believe will help seriously reduce the onslaught of illegal robocalls that Americans face.

The bill before the House today is the result of bipartisan negotiations, which included industry and public interest stakeholders. This bill was reported unanimously out of the Communications and Technology Subcommittee, which I chair, as well as the full Energy and Commerce Committee.

I am also pleased that the language from the STOP Robocalls Act, which Ranking Member LATTA and I introduced, was included in this bill. These provisions allow phone carriers to automatically enable robocall blocking services by default on phone lines.

While these technologies have been available on an opt-in basis, too many of our seniors and, frankly, too many people in general just don't know about these services and how to sign up for them.

Allowing these services to be enabled by default allows all consumers to benefit from these technologies without having to go through the onerous signup process, particularly for seniors and those most vulnerable to scam calls.

These provisions also include requirements that the new opt-out robocall blocking services do not result in new consumer fees. The bill also requires all carriers to adopt call authentication technology, which would enable

people to be certain that the call they receive—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. The call authentication technology would enable people to be certain that the number they see on their caller ID is really the number the call is coming from.

All too often, people get calls that look like they are coming from down the street, but they are really coming from scammers half a world away.

This legislation came about through the hard work of majority staff and minority staff of the Energy and Commerce Committee, and I would like to thank both staffs on the majority and minority for their hard work and diligence to get this bill to the floor.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS).

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank the chairman and I thank the ranking member.

Robocalls and spoofing have been a burden to Americans for years. It is very simple; it goes without saying: We must end these bad robocalls. Our constituents are fed up.

At a hearing 3 years ago, I was able to highlight a constituent who received hundreds of calls daily to his home phone. His quality of life became so poor, Madam Speaker, he had to replace his phone hardware and phone number to get the peace he deserved in his own home. The Stopping Bad Robocalls Act will help ensure that situations like this become less frequent and, eventually, nonexistent.

This bill will provide much-needed authority for the FCC to develop rules for blocking robocall violators and enhance the ability to pursue these bad actors and bring them to justice for taking advantage of the American people, especially our seniors.

I am also pleased this package includes the Ending One-Ring Scams Act, which Representative CLARKE and I introduced this year. This provision will direct the FCC to target one of the newest forms of caller scams and show that we are serious in combating all forms of illegal phone fraud, no matter the tactics used.

I strongly support the Stop Bad Robocalls Act, and I urge the Senate to pass this much-needed legislation, as well.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

Mr. MCNERNEY. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding and for his hard work on this; the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. DOYLE; the ranking member; and the staff members. Great bill here.

I rise in support of H.R. 3375, the Stopping Bad Robocalls Act.

Today, Californians and Americans across the country are receiving more unwanted robocalls than ever before. This is something I often hear about from my constituents.

Nearly 48 billion robocalls were made in 2018, an increase of 17 billion calls in just 1 year. More than 40 percent of these calls are illegal scams. They are defrauding consumers; they are disruptive; and they are costing victims an average of \$430 per scam.

I am worried that the real risk here is that we are making our phone system obsolete, because people just don't want to pick up their phones anymore.

Part of the problem is that our current legal framework doesn't go far enough in deterring these harmful practices. That is why I am pleased that H.R. 3375 includes an amendment that I offered with my colleague Mr. FLORES, during, our full committee markup.

Our provision will create disincentives for the most egregious violators of the law. Specifically, our provision will empower the Federal Communications Commission to assess an additional \$10,000 penalty for robocall violations where the offender acted with intent to cause the violation.

Creating these disincentives is critical for protecting consumers and putting abusive practices to an end. I am proud to cosponsor this bipartisan, commonsense legislation, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3375, the Stopping Bad Robocalls Act. These unwanted and annoying robocalls, which are increasing at an alarming rate, need to end.

I am very pleased that the House has set aside partisan differences and worked together on legislation to benefit all Americans and address this serious issue.

This important legislation would require service providers to implement new technology that ensures caller ID is authenticated and establishes additional protections for consumers receiving unwanted and sometimes fraudulent—robocalls.

I am also pleased that H.R. 3375 includes legislation that I sponsored with my colleague, Representative BUTTERFIELD, which would require the FCC to publish an annual report on the private-led efforts to trace the origin of unlawful robocalls, an important step in stopping these bad actors from reaching consumers.

This kind of illegal, annoying, and harassing activity must stop, and I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

□ 1445

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman

from New York (Ms. CLARKE), vice chair of our committee.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Madam Speaker, as vice chair of the Energy and Commerce Committee, I rise today to thank the House Energy and Commerce Committee Chairman FRANK PALLONE and Ranking Member WALDEN, and Subcommittee Chair MIKE DOYLE and Ranking Member LATTA, for their leadership on this bipartisan effort to bring this important piece of legislation to the floor.

Today, I want to speak to the intrusive reality and damaging repercussions of robocalls and voice my support for H.R. 3375, the Stopping Bad Robocalls Act.

While the illegality of these calls is an issue, the insistent presence of them is causing American citizens to no longer view their phone as a legitimate form of communication, thus impacting legitimate business.

Adding to this, robocalls are actively hurting the pockets of Americans, as multitudes are scammed daily, costing the American public millions of dollars.

During committee markup, I introduced the Clarke-Bilirakis amendment based on the base bill, Ending One-Ring Scams Act of 2019, and, Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. BILIRAKIS for his leadership.

This was a bipartisan effort to ensure that the American people are protected from this harmful culture of one-ring scams.

The nature of these one-ring scams may seem ridiculous. However, they have been effective in scamming the American people. With one-ring scams, the goal of the scammer is not for you to answer, but, rather, for you to make the call back.

One-ring calls may appear to be from phone numbers somewhere in the United States, including initial digits that resemble U.S. area codes. If one calls back, these citizens risk being connected to a phone number outside of the United States, thus resulting in one being charged a fee for just connecting.

Ad nauseam, the good people of Brooklyn's Ninth Congressional District have voiced their outrage with the state of their security and privacy as the threat of one-ring scams grows more prevalent.

Madam Speaker, before I conclude my remarks, I would be remiss if I did not thank my colleagues who helped lead on today's effort, Congressman BILIRAKIS and Congressman VAN DREW.

Madam Speaker, I want to say to those who are fraudulent: Today, game over.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE), a valuable member of our Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. GIANFORTE. Madam Speaker, Montanans are bombarded with robocalls. Last year alone, Americans received over 48 billion robocalls. That is nearly 100,000 robocalls per minute.

Too many robocalls are deceptive and destructive, from bogus insurance offers to threats of legal action. Scam artists scheme to steal hardworking Montanans' private, personal, and financial information. Sometimes, they go even farther.

A young woman from Bozeman received a call from her little brother's phone number. She picked up the call, but it wasn't her brother. It was a scammer using her brother's number. Tragically, her little brother had died of a drug overdose a few months earlier. She was devastated and shaken. This is disgusting and should not happen.

Today, we are taking a big step forward. We are empowering consumers. Phone companies will provide consumers with call authentication tools and blocking services at no cost. Illegal callers will face more jail time.

Let's get robocall relief across the finish line for the American people.

Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to pass this legislation.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRIST).

Mr. CRIST. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman PALLONE for his leadership on this important legislation, and I thank the ranking member.

The American people are fed up with spam calls. They are predatory, incessant, and an invasion of privacy.

We need a comprehensive approach to root them out, and our Federal Government plays an important role in that. Whether it is the FCC, Department of Justice, Homeland Security, or FBI, these agencies should have the authorities and tools to shut down these spammers' calls, and these powers are maximized when they are coordinated.

That is why I included in this legislation the creation of the Spam Calls Task Force. The task force will coordinate the Federal response.

Madam Speaker, I also thank Representative DARREN SOTO for his help with this.

I am confident that by working together, we can all put a stop to spam calls once and for all, and Americans will no longer have to fear robocalls.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mrs. RODGERS).

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation, the Stopping Bad Robocalls Act.

We all agree that robocalls are annoying, and they are a nuisance. What is worse is that these calls are often scams, scams that are becoming more and more sophisticated each day. When our phone rings, we are just one answer away from being a victim of identity theft. That needs to change.

This legislation will restore trust that Americans can again answer their phones.

Madam Speaker, I have a constituent who calls my office nearly every time

he receives a robocall. He has begged us to do something. After today, I look forward to sharing with him that we listened and took action to solve this problem.

Madam Speaker, on his behalf and on behalf of all those whom I have the privilege of representing in eastern Washington, I urge support of the Stopping Bad Robocalls Act.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MURPHY).

Mrs. MURPHY. Madam Speaker, Congress has a terrible reputation for being too partisan, but there is one issue that has strong bipartisan agreement in this Congress and across this country, and that is: Fraudulent robocalls must be stopped.

I hear these concerns from my constituents in central Florida on a regular basis. It is one of the top issues that constituents routinely write my office about.

Americans received over 48 billion robocalls last year. Nearly half of the calls that Americans receive are robocalls, many trying to scam people out of their hard-earned money.

Floridians have received over 2.2 billion robocalls so far this year alone. My hometown of Orlando is among the most targeted cities in the country, having received nearly 350 million robocalls.

Robocalls are more than a nuisance. They pose a direct threat to consumers.

Often disguised using fake caller IDs, like hospitals and government agencies, robocallers attempt to trick people into providing personal information, preying especially on our seniors.

The American people have had enough, and they are demanding swift action from this body.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to help introduce this bill, which is a great first step to protect Americans from robocall harassment. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER), a valued member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Stopping Bad Robocalls Act. This legislation will seek to stem a problem affecting nearly everyone I know, and that is the issue of robocalls.

Last year, we had almost 50 billion robocalls in the United States. This year, we have already had almost 30 billion robocalls, or roughly 90 robocalls per person.

It is an issue that everyone can agree is a nuisance and should be addressed. That is why I join my colleagues in supporting this legislation to end this practice and once again make it possible to answer a phone call from a phone number you don't recognize.

This bill will give the FCC the authority to move forward with changes under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act and to ensure that these changes will lead to an effective effort to get rid of unwanted robocalls.

Not only will we see a greater ability to stop these, but we will see penalties that will, hopefully, deter future efforts by bad actors.

Madam Speaker, I applaud my colleagues on the Energy and Commerce Committee for their work on this legislation, especially since it is an issue that affects everyone. For this reason, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and to help us get this bill to the finish line.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. PALLONE for yielding.

This issue has brought everybody together. It seems to be more popular than ice cream or even fried chicken.

It is amazing such a bill could come about, but it is important because we get these calls that take up our time.

I have a landline, and I have two cellphones. I don't even answer my landline anymore. When I come home from a trip, coming up to Washington and then going home, my service is full of automatic dialers, robocalls. Constituents who want to get through can't get through because the answering machine has been used up.

They try to take advantage of people, scam them into buying products they shouldn't. They waste our time. They ruin our opportunity to have a regular life during the day.

Madam Speaker, I thank all the sponsors. I am proud to be a supporter and a cosponsor. I look forward to voting for this. I look forward to the day when I can pick up my phone and it will be Bear Bryant or somebody looking to reach out to call his mama.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS), a valuable member of the committee.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, we have all gotten robocalls. They are annoying, disrupting, and actually can be dangerous.

Oftentimes, robocalls prey on our communities' most vulnerable populations in hopes of capitalizing on their personal and private information. Unfortunately, this problem is growing.

H.R. 3375, the Stopping Bad Robocalls Act, is a bipartisan solution, ensuring that calls consumers receive are verified as legitimate.

I am also pleased that the legislation includes a bill that I was an original cosponsor of called the Locking Up Robocallers Act. It requires the Federal Communications Commission to report particularly malicious robocall schemes to the Justice Department so that Federal resources may continue to be properly leveraged to stop these schemes.

As a former U.S. attorney, I am really proud that the Justice Department, working with the FTC and local law enforcement, has already taken enforcement actions in over 94 cases, which has yielded blocking of more than 1 billion robocalls so far.

Madam Speaker, I am reassured that with this bill, they will be able to more efficiently and consistently pursue robocaller abusers. For these reasons and many more, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, can I inquire as to the amount of time on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. UNDERWOOD).

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Madam Speaker, 64. That is the number of robocalls that the average Illinoisan has received in 2019 alone, over 1 billion total. Nationwide, half of all calls to cellphones are robocalls.

Yesterday, in my staff meeting, our discussion of floor consideration of the Stopping Bad Robocalls Act was literally interrupted by two different robocalls.

Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman and ranking member on behalf of myself and my community in Illinois' 14th Congressional District for their hard work to bring this commonsense, bipartisan, and incredibly important bill to the floor.

Robocalls aren't just annoying; they can be dangerous. They are used by fraudsters and unscrupulous debt collectors to scare hardworking Americans to fall for their scams.

I am so proud to cosponsor the Stopping Bad Robocalls Act. This bill ensures that consumers can block calls they don't want, with no extra charge. It ensures that every call Illinoisans receive is verified by caller ID, and it strengthens enforcement against scammers and robocall operators.

I am especially glad the bill includes a provision to require the FCC to establish a Hospital Robocall Working Group to ensure that robocalls don't threaten hospitals' ability to provide timely, lifesaving care.

Madam Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, robocalls have moved beyond a simple nuisance. Sophisticated actors are now using robocalls to trick people into providing sensitive information by posing as legitimate organizations.

When this happens to hospitals, patients have no reason to believe that there is a fraudulent actor on the other line, leading them to reveal sensitive health data and sensitive financial information. This activity threatens the integrity of real health-related phone

calls and jeopardizes the relationship between the patient and their provider.

Even more challenging than explaining to consumers that the calls from your phone number are not always from your organization is the response time required.

□ 1500

According to testimony by Dave Summitt of the H. Lee Moffitt Cancer Center, in a 90-day period, they received over 6,600 external calls identified as a Moffitt internal phone number, requiring 65 hours of response time. This is time that could have been used to support the hospital rather than respond to fraudulent calls.

During the Energy and Commerce Committee markup, I offered an amendment with Mrs. DINGELL of Michigan to establish a hospital robocall protection group at the Federal Communications Commission. This group will issue best practices to help combat unlawful robocalls made to hospitals, as well as those made spoofing a legitimate hospital phone number.

The hospital robocall protection group will assist any hospital to combat these fraudulent robocalls so that they may focus on serving patients. A patient should not have to worry about whether they are speaking with their real doctor or their real hospital when discussing sensitive health information, and providers should not have to deal with disruptive false claims.

This amendment was adopted in committee, and I look forward to the best practices being put forward in the hospital robocall protection group.

The fraud committed on Americans by illegal robocallers is going to end. This bipartisan legislation creates a robust framework designed to protect consumers from the fraud and nuisance of these calls.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a yes vote on the underlying legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I thank all of the members who were able to work together to produce this great legislation, and there are a lot.

I thank Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. OLSON, Mr. KIM, Mrs. BROOKS, Mr. BRINDISI, and Mr. KUSTOFF for introducing the Locking Up Robocalls Act, which was added to this legislation in section 9.

I thank Ms. CLARKE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. ROUDA, Ms. FOXX, and Mr. WALBERG for introducing the Ending One-Ring Scams Act, which was added to this legislation in section 10.

I thank Mr. CRIST for introducing his Spam Calls Task Force Act, which was added to this legislation in section 11.

I thank Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. GIANFORTE for introducing the Tracing Back and Catching Unlawful Robocalls Act, which was added in section 13.

I thank Mrs. DINGELL and Dr. BURGESS for introducing their Protecting

Patients and Doctors from Unlawful Robocalls Act, which was added to the bill in section 14.

And I thank Mr. FLORES and Mr. McNERNEY for offering their amendment to increase the financial penalties for illegal robocallers.

Mr. Speaker, I also thank my partners—Mr. WALDEN, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. LATTA—for working with me to introduce the bill, which included at introduction Mr. LATTA's and Mr. DOYLE's STOP Robocalls Act in section 8.

I also would like to quickly thank the staff—Alex Hoehn-Saric, AJ Brown, Jennifer Epperson, Dan Miller, Robin Colwell, Tim Kurth—for all their hard work, and, in particular, Gerry Leverich, who is here, for all his time and energy to get this bill to the floor today. I am very proud for all our members and staff for this important bill.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a few letters and statements for the RECORD: a letter from AARP on behalf of its nearly 38 million members urging a vote in favor of the bill; a letter from more than 80 organizations representing consumers throughout the U.S., including Consumer Reports and the National Consumer Law Center, among others, urging strong support by members of the bill; and a list of supportive statements from carriers and relevant associations, including USTelecom, The Broadband Association; CTIA, The Wireless Association; NCTA, The Internet & Television Association; Charter Communications, and Verizon.

AARP,

Washington, DC, July 23, 2019.

HON. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

HON. KEVIN McCARTHY,
Republican Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI AND LEADER McCARTHY: On behalf of our nearly 38 million members and all older Americans nationwide, AARP is writing to urge a vote in favor of H.R. 3375, the Stopping Bad Robocalls Act, bipartisan legislation that will help fight back against illegal robocalls.

AARP has a long history of fighting for consumer protections for older Americans. Unwanted robocalls are a rich playground for scammers to deceive victims into paying money under false pretenses. Through our nationwide Fraud Watch Network initiative, we work to empower consumers to spot and avoid scams, and we provide support and guidance to victims and their families when fraud happens.

AARP is pleased that H.R. 3375 appropriately emphasizes consumer consent regarding the receipt of automatically dialed calls and expands the enforcement provisions of the Communications Act by extending the statute of limitations. The bill specifies that consumers should not face additional charges for having robocalls blocked through authentication technology and sets reasonable deadlines for the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) to prescribe regulations in the ongoing WC Docket No. 17-97.

AARP also supports the provisions of the bill that require the FCC to report on the implementation of the reassigned number database, which will reduce the incidence of repeated calls to innocent customers based

on the telephone number's previous owner. Likewise, we support the requirement of an annual report to Congress on the FCC's enforcement actions.

All Americans will benefit from the provisions of H.R. 3375 that promote an accurate call authentication framework and prevent consumers from being charged for blocking technology. We again urge you to enact H.R. 3375, and we look forward to working with you on a bipartisan basis to combat unwanted and abusive robocalls against older Americans. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me, or have your staff contact our Government Affairs staff.

Sincerely,

NANCY A. LEAMOND,
Executive Vice President and
Chief Advocacy & Engagement Officer.

**SUPPORT STRONG LEGISLATION TO STOP
ABUSIVE ROBOCALLS**

(July 23, 2019)

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The undersigned organizations representing consumers throughout the United States strongly urge your support for H.R. 3375, the Stopping Bad Robocalls Act. This bipartisan legislation, which the Committee on Energy and Commerce approved by a unanimous vote of 48-0, will help secure important protections against abusive robocalling.

Robocalls are an ever-increasing plague. Last year, Americans received an estimated 47.8 billion robocalls. They harass us, disrupt our peace of mind, interrupt important time with family, and interfere with important communications. Many of these annoying automated calls are to sell products or to collect debts. They also enable scams to enter our homes. Truecaller found that consumers had lost an estimated \$10.5 billion to phone scams in a single 12-month period. And spoofing, in which a caller sends a false number in the caller ID, compounds the problem, impeding call-blocking services and tricking consumers into picking up the phone.

A Consumer Reports national survey released earlier this year found that 70 percent of consumers don't even answer the phone anymore if they don't recognize the number, because their phones are so overrun with unwanted robocalls.

H.R. 3375 would strengthen our laws to curb this abusive robocalling.

It would direct the FCC to issue clear regulations to better ensure that automated calls and texts cannot be made without the consumer's prior consent, by requiring that the technologies that enable unwanted calls are properly defined and consumers can stop unwanted calls by withdrawing consent, and closing off avenues for callers to seek loopholes.

It would direct the FCC to require phone companies to provide effective call authentication capability, at no charge to consumers, to better identify and stop robocalling and texting that uses deceptively "spoofed" phone numbers.

It would strengthen FCC powers to impose forfeiture penalties for intentional violations.

It would direct the FCC to oversee creation of a database that callers can check in order to avoid making robocalls and texts to a telephone number that has been reassigned to a different consumer who has not given consent, and would clarify that the caller must have consent from the person actually being called.

Consumers are calling on Congress to enact these reforms now.

We strongly urge your support for H.R. 3375.

Sincerely,

Allied Progress; Americans for Financial Reform; Center for Responsible Lending;

Consumer Action; Consumer Federation of America; Consumer Reports; Electronic Privacy Information Center (EPIC); Justice in Aging; National Association of Consumer Advocates; National Association of Consumer Bankruptcy Attorneys; National Consumer Law Center on behalf of its low-income clients; National Consumers League; National Fair Housing Alliance; National Legal Aid & Defender Association; National Rural Social Work Caucus; Public Citizen; Public Knowledge.

Center for Digital Democracy, Alabama; The Alabama Appleseed Center for Law & Justice; Alaska Public Interest Research Group (AKPIRG); Center for Economic Integrity, Arizona; Arkansans Against Abusive Payday Lending, Arkansas; Arkansas Community Institute, Arkansas; California Low-Income Consumer Coalition; Public Law Center, California; Media Alliance, California; California Alliance for Consumer Education; Western Center on Law & Poverty, California.

Privacy Rights Clearinghouse, California; Public Good Law Center, California; Consumers for Auto Reliability and Safety, California; Public Counsel, California; Justice & Diversity Center of the Bar Association of San Francisco/Consumer Advocacy; Funeral Consumer Alliance of Connecticut, Inc.; Connecticut Legal Services, Inc.; Tzedek DC, District of Columbia; Legal Aid Service of Broward County, Florida; Florida Alliance for Consumer Protection, Florida; Florida Silver haired Legislature Inc., Florida; Independent Party of Florida, Florida.

Mid-Pinellas Coalition of Neighborhood Associations, Florida; Funeral Consumers Alliance of Sarasota-Manatee, Florida; Green Forest CDC, Georgia; Georgia Watch, Georgia; Woodstock Institute, Illinois; Digital Privacy Alliance, Illinois; Western Illinois Area Agency on Aging; CARPLS Legal Aid, Illinois; Kentucky Equal Justice Center; Maine Center for Economic Policy; Greater Boston Legal Services, on behalf of its low-income clients, Massachusetts; Massachusetts Law Reform Institute; The Midas Collaborative, Massachusetts; Center for Civil Justice, Michigan; Mississippi Center for Justice, Mississippi; Montana Organizing Project, Montana.

New Jersey Citizen Action; Legal Services of New Jersey; Empire Justice Center, New York; Public Utility Law Project of New York; Financial Protection Law Center, North Carolina; Oregon Legal Guides; Oregon Consumer League; SeniorLAW Center, Pennsylvania; The One Less Foundation, Pennsylvania; Philadelphia VIP, Pennsylvania; South Carolina Appleseed Legal Justice Center.

Tennessee Citizen Action; Texas Appleseed; Friends for Life; Texas Legal Services Center; Community Justice Program, Texas; Texas Access to Justice Commission; Texas A&M University; Family Violence Prevention Services, Texas; AAA Fair Credit Foundation, Utah; Virginia Citizens Consumer Council; Statewide Poverty Action Network, Washington; Mountain State Justice, Inc., West Virginia; West Virginia Center on Budget and Policy; WV Citizen Action Group, West Virginia; National Association of Social Workers West Virginia Chapter.

STATEMENTS OF SUPPORT STOPPING BAD ROBOCALLS ACT

[From the Committee on Energy & Commerce, July 2019]

CONSUMER AND PRIVACY ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING HR 3375, THE STOPPING BAD ROBOCALLS ACT

Americans for Financial Reform; Center for Responsible Lending; Consumer Action; Consumer Federation of America; National

Association of Consumer Advocates; National Consumer Law Center on behalf of its low-income clients; Public Citizen; Public Knowledge.

STATEMENTS OF SUPPORT

Maureen Mahoney, policy analyst for Consumer Reports: "Robocalls are a pervasive, persistent problem, and consumers are desperate for relief from these unsolicited messages. These calls don't just irritate consumers—they interfere with the phone service for which we pay dearly, and they subject people to scams. By one estimate, consumers lost \$10.5 billion to phone scams in one single year. We commend Chairman Pallone and Ranking Member Walden for introducing the Stopping Bad Robocalls Act, which will help ensure that all consumers have effective protections from deceptively spoofed calls, including calls from scammers. The bill will also help get rid of loopholes in order to stop robocallers from skirting the law. We look forward to working with legislators to ensure that consumers get the protections they deserve."

Margot Saunders, Senior Counsel for National Consumer Law Center: "This bipartisan bill is an important step forward in the fight to stop unwanted and illegal robocalls. There's still more to be done and there is a lot of responsibility placed on the FCC to protect consumers. Robocalls plague voters of all political stripes so we are especially pleased to see a bipartisan effort on this bill. We hope this is the first of several positive steps that Congress will take."

AARP: "AARP commends Chairman Pallone, Ranking Member Walden, Chairman Doyle, and Ranking Member Latta for their bipartisan commitment to address the serious problem of illegal and unwanted robocalls. AARP shares your belief that illegal robocalls continue to place all Americans at risk of scams and fraud. New AARP Fraud Watch Network research shows that consumers are more likely to answer a call if it is coming from a familiar area code or telephone exchange, which is precisely what scammers are exploiting. Older Americans are particularly vulnerable to phone scam victimization, which can wipe out their life savings. AARP looks forward to working with you and Congress on a bipartisan basis to combat unwanted and abusive robocalls."

Jonathan Spalter, President and CEO of USTelecom: "Chairman Pallone, Ranking Member Walden and the bipartisan members of the House Energy & Commerce Committee delivered a loud and clear message to illegal robocallers today: 'enough.' These legislative proposals add to the growing momentum and broad partnership among lawmakers, regulators, industry and innovators of all stripes who are closely collaborating to end the illegal robocall plague scamming and spoofing consumers."

Kelly Cole, Senior Vice President of Government Affairs for CTIA: "We commend Chairman Pallone, Ranking Member Walden, Chairman Doyle and Ranking Member Latta for their Stopping Bad Robocalls Act. The wireless industry is committed to combating illegal robocalls and protecting consumers, and we thank Committee Leadership for tackling this important issue. We look forward to working on getting robocall legislation enacted."

Robert Fisher, Senior Vice President of Federal Legislative Affairs for Verizon: "We applaud Chairman Pallone, Ranking Member Walden, and the rest of the House Energy and Commerce committee co-sponsors of this bill for their continued efforts to protect consumers from disruptive and harassing robocalls. Enough is enough—it's time for Americans to hang up on abusive robocallers once and for all. Verizon has already begun

deploying the STIR-SHAKEN call authentication protocol for IP Voice services, and we welcome the continued momentum toward a bipartisan, comprehensive solution that empowers service providers, law enforcement, and most of all consumers. We commend this legislation and look forward to working with Congress to make abusive robocalls history.”

Charter Communications: “Charter wants to see an end to robocalls and we commend Chairman Pallone and Ranking Member Walden for introducing legislation that will help do just that. This bipartisan bill is an important step in curbing unwanted and illegal calls. As we work to implement the call authentication protocol SHAKEN/STIR by the end of the year in addition to our currently offered call blocking, screening, and identification features like the Nomorobo app, we will continue to work with Congress to hopefully stop these disruptive calls once and for all.”

NCTA—The Internet & Television Association: “Robocalls have become a scourge on our daily lives causing many Americans to simply stop answering their phones. This is why we welcome the bipartisan leadership of Chairman Pallone and Ranking Member Walden to introduce the Stopping Bad Robocalls Act. This legislation along with efforts by the FCC to combat robocalls are critical to protecting consumers from this nuisance.”

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, again, this is a bipartisan effort and a bicameral effort. We are not doing messaging here, Mr. Speaker. This is a bill that will become law, and the President will sign it once we get it passed in the Senate and we have a final bill.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3375, the “Stopping Bad Robocalls Act.”

H.R. 3375 will require the Federal Communications Commission to update the definition of what qualifies as a robocall and ensure that any attempt to circumvent its rules using new or different robocall technology is outlawed.

The Stopping Bad Robocalls Act would also require telecommunications corporations to implement new technology to ensure that calls are not spam.

In addition, it will yield more efficient investigations conducted by government officials and the heightened enforcement of anti-robocall rules.

In June of 2019 4.4 billion robocalls were placed nationwide.

Texas led all 50 states, receiving over 500 million robocalls in that month.

Mr. Speaker, robocalls have become an overwhelming issue in our country and threaten to paralyze our most critical communications lines.

These callers are not only a nuisance but are also predatory.

They have begun to target crucial establishments including hospitals, cancer centers, and medical research organizations, creating conditions that can potentially lead to a health crisis.

Administrators at these institutions worry that, without intervention, the myriad of incoming robocalls could eventually outmatch their best efforts to keep hospital phone lines free during emergencies.

Robocallers have gone even further to perform scams using the spoofing tactic, in which they can appear to take on existing phone numbers.

With the aid of spoofing, scammers can take on phone numbers that are the same as or very similar to the numbers of health care providers.

Robocallers use the names and numbers of these organizations, to aid their scam of telling people that they owe money and requesting private information.

We are all aware of the difficulty millions of Americans face in attaining affordable health care.

Robocallers are maliciously taking advantage of these circumstances and seek to profit from the exacerbation of the stress that families are challenged with.

The federal government as well as multiple large telecommunications corporations are equipped with information on these robocallers and the groups whom they seek to take advantage of.

The virulent aspirations of these callers must be met with the commitment of our government to protect our citizens by placing the responsibility on these corporations to protect consumers.

I urge all members to join me in voting to pass H.R. 3375, the “Stopping Bad Robocalls Act.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DELGADO). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3375, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

AUTISM COLLABORATION, ACCOUNTABILITY, RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND SUPPORT ACT OF 2019

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1058) to reauthorize certain provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to autism, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1058

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Autism Collaboration, Accountability, Research, Education, and Support Act of 2019” or the “Autism CARES Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. EXPANSION, INTENSIFICATION, AND CO-ORDINATION OF ACTIVITIES OF THE NIH WITH RESPECT TO RESEARCH ON AUTISM SPECTRUM DISORDER.

Section 409C of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 284g) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking “and toxicology” and inserting “toxicology, and interventions to maximize outcomes for individuals with autism spectrum disorder”; and

(B) by striking the second sentence and inserting the following: “Such research shall investigate the causes (including possible environmental causes), diagnosis or ruling out, early and ongoing detection, prevention, services across the lifespan, supports, intervention, and treatment of autism spectrum disorder, including dissemination and implementation of clinical care, supports, interventions, and treatments.”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the second sentence, by striking “cause” and all that follows through “disorder” and inserting “causes, diagnosis, early and ongoing detection, prevention, and treatment of autism spectrum disorder across the lifespan”; and

(ii) in the third sentence, by striking “neurobiology” and all that follows through the period and inserting “neurobiology, genetics, genomics, psychopharmacology, developmental psychology, behavioral psychology, and clinical psychology.”; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by adding at the end the following:

“(D) REDUCING DISPARITIES.—The Director may consider, as appropriate, the extent to which a center can demonstrate availability and access to clinical services for youth and adults from diverse racial, ethnic, geographic, or linguistic backgrounds in decisions about awarding grants to applicants which meet the scientific criteria for funding under this section.”.

SEC. 3. PROGRAMS RELATING TO AUTISM.

(a) DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES SURVEILLANCE AND RESEARCH PROGRAM.—Section 399AA of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280i) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking “adults on autism spectrum disorder” and inserting “adults with autism spectrum disorder”;

(2) in subsection (a)(2)—

(A) by striking “State and local public health officials” and inserting “State, local, and Tribal public health officials”;

(B) by striking “or other developmental disabilities” and inserting “and other developmental disabilities”;

(3) in subsection (a)(3), by striking “a university, or any other educational institution” and inserting “a university, any other educational institution, an Indian tribe, or a tribal organization”;

(4) in subsection (b)(2)(A), by striking “relevant State and local public health officials, private sector developmental disability researchers, and advocates for individuals with developmental disabilities” and inserting “State, local, and Tribal public health officials, private sector developmental disability researchers, advocates for individuals with autism spectrum disorder, and advocates for individuals with other developmental disabilities”;

(5) in subsection (d)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively; and

(B) by inserting before paragraph (2), as so redesignated, the following new paragraph:

“(1) INDIAN TRIBE; TRIBAL ORGANIZATION.—The terms ‘Indian tribe’ and ‘tribal organization’ have the meanings given such terms in section 4 of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act.”;

(6) in subsection (e), by striking “2019” and inserting “2024”.

(b) AUTISM EDUCATION, EARLY DETECTION, AND INTERVENTION.—Section 399BB of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280i-1) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)—

(A) by striking “individuals with autism spectrum disorder or other developmental disabilities” and inserting “individuals with autism spectrum disorder and other developmental disabilities”; and

(B) by striking “children with autism spectrum disorder” and all that follows through “disabilities”; and inserting “individuals with